

# THE NEW REPUBLIC

## *A Journal of Opinion*

South State Normal School Library  
S. D. B. S. D. B.

VOL. 108, NO. 13

NEW YORK, MONDAY, MARCH 29, 1943

NUMBER 1478

### Churchill on the Peace

The most important observation about Prime Minister Churchill's radio address is that it is the first detailed pronouncement by him about the post-war world. He has been exceedingly reluctant to discuss this subject while the war is being fought, and, aside from the sponsorship of the Atlantic Charter and a few unfortunate remarks about the British Empire and its colonies, we have been left to guess what his opinions are. His hesitation was still evident in the speech, but we are more fortunate to have him speak late than never. It is at once better than we might have expected from a conservative imperialist and not so good as it ought to have been. How good it is, we may mark by comparing his approval of certain measures with the attitude toward similar proposals adopted by conservatives in this country. He wants Britain, the United States and Russia to take the lead in guaranteeing peace and reconstituting Europe. He wants federations of smaller states, and a Council of Europe. On the domestic field, he favors an extension of social insurance, a national health service, better educational facilities and the abolition of unemployment through a partnership between state action and private enterprise.

Progressive opinion in both Britain and the United States will, however, note certain important deficiencies. First of all, he refuses to enter binding commitments in either the foreign or the domestic field until after Hitler is beaten, though he is willing for preparatory work to go ahead. Yet daring and effective planning requires commitments. Second, he says nothing about colonies or political and economic imperialism. Third, he does not mention the necessity of international economic institutions as a basis for world coöpera-

tion. On the whole, the speech will confirm the opinion that Churchill's genius as a leader is more distinguished in making war than in organizing peace.

### Congressional Meddling

Why does Congress persist in trying to decide important details concerning the conduct of a war which it has neither the constitutional authority nor the ability to manage? Why must it instruct the army by law to defer all agricultural workers, or not to take fathers until the supply of available single men has been exhausted? Why does it continue to threaten to limit the size of the army according to its own estimate of the facts? These are all important matters; it is the business of the military establishment to plan carefully concerning them and of the civilian war authorities to check the military plans against available manpower and resources. The responsibility for careful, integrated decisions is executive, not legislative. By ill considered legislation Congress can tie the hands of those whose duty it is to win the war in the shortest possible time. This is not a field for the influence of pressure groups.

### Why Mr. Eden Is Here

The best comment we have seen on the visit to America of Anthony Eden appeared a few days ago in The New York Post and we reprint it herewith:

Here is a shocking possibility: That American foreign policy is deliberately aimed at establishing a bloc of conservative, or anti-democratic, or semi-fascist, or fascist nations in Europe, as a bulwark against Russia.

There used to be something like the feel of a clean, fresh breeze associated with the mention of the name of America in the foreign affairs of the world.

### CONTENTS

|                                                      |     |
|------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| The Week . . . . .                                   | 395 |
| Editorials                                           |     |
| The Senate and the Tiger . . . . .                   | 399 |
| Support the Labor Board! . . . . .                   | 400 |
| General Articles                                     |     |
| Inside Russia . . . . . Avrahm Yarmolinsky           | 402 |
| Meat-Axing Manpower . . . . . John Beecher           | 406 |
| The Anti-Fourth Term Drive . . . . . Irving Dilliard | 409 |
| Soldiers' Prose . . . . . Lt. Frank Smith            | 411 |

|                                                     |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Troop Movement (verse) . . . . . Vincent McHugh     | 412 |
| Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B.                 | 413 |
| "The Hard Way" . . . . . Manny Farber               | 414 |
| The Bandwagon . . . . .                             | 414 |
| Correspondence . . . . .                            | 415 |
| Books in Review                                     |     |
| Books Are Too Long . . . . . Malcolm Cowley         | 418 |
| Why the Japanese Fight . . . . . Helen Mears        | 419 |
| Guns and Butter . . . . . William Miller            | 419 |
| Poets—Timely and Timeless . . . . . Babette Deutsch | 420 |
| A Reader's List . . . . .                           | 421 |

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1943, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49TH ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.  
ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

Today The Manchester Guardian, England's great liberal newspaper, scolds America for having "a hundred times" more anti-Russian sentiment than England, than conservative, old-school-tie England.

Today our Ambassador in Moscow sounds off against Russia, while England's does not.

Today we praise Franco, and specifically subscribe to the permanence of his fascist regime in Spain, while England does not.

What does it mean that de Gaulle works with Russia, and England works with de Gaulle, but that we work with Giraud, until finally the point is reached at which England, too, has to accept Giraud? Are we, in a sense, using our great weight in world affairs to force a kind of appeasement of America on England, for fear of us?

What does it mean that we have deliberately cut off the hands that were extended to us by the underground in France, and by the democratic movement in Spain?

What does it mean that American isolationists (who have really become the American anti-Russian party) find increasingly that they can do business with the administration: anti-Willkie business, anti-de Gaulle business, anti-Hill-Hatch-Burton-Ball business and pro-Franco business?

What does it mean that in each case, Vichy, North Africa, Spain, the Otto of Austria business, we are compelled (we are blandly told) to make certain decisions because of "necessity"—and yet all the decisions point in the same direction, toward the proposed reconstruction of a reactionary Europe? If these necessities are necessities, and not something else, why are they not controlling upon England?

What does it mean when we permit Giraud, under the aegis of our own fine, clean troops, to disenfranchise a hundred thousand Algerian Jews, whose citizenship stems from a French law adopted before Giraud was born? Are we so intent on seeing that French state power goes into conservative hands that we will swallow a dose of anti-Semitism itself to make the arrangement?

Is our country chasing the will-o'-the-wisp that so many "democratic" statesmen pursued during the thirties, the hope that out of pins and tissue paper and a touch of reaction a Europe could be put together that could refuse to work with Russia and even defy her?

Are we preparing another agony of disappointment for the brutalized people of the continent of Europe?

And if we are trying this, at the twelfth hour, what can the effect be except to drive the people of Europe into the arms of Russia?

What alternative does our incredible policy leave to them? We have, a hundred times, shown our disdain for the truly revolutionary, truly democratic forces on the Continent. We have thrown away our moral leadership over those forces. We have shown them that we are more easily moved by pressure from reaction and isolation and proto-fascism at home, than by faith in the European masses. We have all but convinced them that, except for one or two outstanding scoundrels, there is no creature in the world so low that we will not deal with him.

*We believe* Anthony Eden has come here to plead with us to deal with Russia as England deals with her. We shall believe that, in spite of all denials which may come forth, for our power to obtain such statements is great.

*We believe* that an appalling danger of world catastro-

phe has been resurrected by us, and by us alone, out of a decade in which it seemed safely buried.

*We believe* that the future of the world depends on whether Mr. Roosevelt will now at last take sides in the war against fascism, as well as merely in the war against Hitler.

These are blunt words but we believe they are justified by the available evidence. The New York Post has been one of the most loyal supporters of the Roosevelt administration and the New Deal, and we hope that the President will give its statement the consideration which such words, from such a source, deserve.

### The Franco Mystery

There has never been a mystery about Franco's stand in the war. His latest speech against communism, which he likes to identify with democracy, was not needed to make his position perfectly clear. He is in the war on the side of Hitler. He is in it for several reasons, chief among which is the realization that, when Hitler falls, his own pretense of a government cannot survive for a year. He is reinforcing the Spanish division now fighting on the Russian front. He has many divisions in Spanish Morocco, and by threatening the American line of communication, they have certainly helped to delay the Tunisian campaign. His diplomats are working for the Axis in South America, and probably in London and Washington. He does not want to fight us openly, but if Hitler insists, he will reluctantly take the plunge. Already his airfields are plentifully stocked with American gasoline and are ready to be occupied by German planes. The officials in Washington, who claim to be puzzled by Franco's policy, are exactly like the man whose wife was obviously unfaithful and who thereupon complained, "Always this uncertainty! It's killing me."

The real Franco mystery is why the State Department has continued to believe against all evidence that Franco could be bribed into neutrality. The real mystery is why we have offered him loan after loan and why we have permitted Spanish ships to pass the blockade without receiving anything substantial in return. Four months ago we perhaps could have forced him to loosen his ties with Hitler as the price of further concessions; but the concessions have now been made, and Franco is still working against us. It may be that the only safe method of preventing a German attack through Spain, made with Franco's help, is for us to keep the Germans busy by attacking the coast of Europe.

### Manpower Saboteur

A few days ago ex-Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker took up two hours of the Senate Military Affairs Committee's time to repeat the anti-labor act he has been putting on all over the country wherever he could scare up an audience. Rickenbacker had been invited to

testify on the Austin-Wadsworth bill to draft civilian manpower, but he opened his remarks by saying that he had not even read the Austin-Wadsworth bill and that "I would rather stay with a subject I know something about." That was labor, he said.

Rickenbacker played to a full house. Sen. "Cotton Ed" Smith and Rep. John Rankin were among the committee's special guests for the occasion. Several of the more enlightened members of the committee did not show up for one reason or another, and Senator O'Mahoney was practically the only questioner who made any effort to pin down any of Rickenbacker's wild charges. Rick talked a lot about draft-dodgers who had gone into war industries to get out of fighting and about how what is needed is to "take government interference out of management and racketeering away from labor." Then, he told the committee, everything would be all right, and we would have manpower enough and to spare. The main thing is to wipe out New Deal labor laws, especially any provision for overtime after forty hours per week. Forty-eight hours with no overtime is the Rickenbacker answer. Repeatedly when pressed for facts to back up his statements, the ex-Captain mumbled something about confidential sources and things he knew but couldn't tell. He let the committee in on one of his inside tips: absenteeism, according to the Rickenbacker crystal ball, is rumored to be twice as high in union plants as in non-union plants; he suggested that the committee get busy and look into this rumored center of infection. Piece-work rates instead of hourly pay, together with an incentive system and the other parts of the Rickenbacker plan, would step up efficiency by 33 1/3 percent practically immediately, Rick promised, while John Rankin and his pals licked their lips with pleasure.

### Race Discrimination in Algeria

When General Giraud announced that he was abrogating the Crémieux Decree, he explained that his purpose was "to eliminate all racial discrimination . . . between native Moslems and native Jews." The Crémieux Decree, issued in 1870, had made the Algerian Jews citizens of France. The Arabs, on the other hand, were merely permitted to apply for French citizenship—and this after meeting certain conditions that were repugnant to orthodox Moslems. At present both races are to be placed on the same footing, with an appearance of equal justice under the law.

But General Giraud has taken an upside-down method of dispensing equal justice. The Arabs are to remain exactly as exploited and underprivileged as they have been in the past. The Jews are to be reduced to the same level by losing the rights that they and their fathers had enjoyed for seventy years, until Vichy began issuing its anti-Semitic laws in 1941. A far better policy would have been simply to return

to the laws of the French Republic—including the Crémieux Decree, which is exactly as valid as all the others, and which General Giraud had no constitutional right to abrogate. Then, as a second step, the Moslems could have been raised to a position of equality by being given the rights of French citizens. That would have to be a gradual process, so as not to upset the present government; but substantial progress in the right direction could have been made this spring. General Giraud, however, has been walking backwards. For an American parallel, let us imagine that all Indians were suddenly ordered to ride in Jim Crow cars—"in order to eliminate racial discrimination against the Negroes."

### Joe Kennedy

There are persistent reports from reliable sources in Washington that the President for some time has been considering giving an important war post to Joe Kennedy, our isolationist ex-Ambassador to Great Britain. Kennedy is the man who thought Britain was finished and who warned that we were in danger of losing any war materials we sent her to help stave off the Nazis. If we had taken his advice two years ago we might now be fighting the Germans in South America instead of Tunisia. Therefore it is disturbing to learn, according to one report, that Kennedy is not merely a chastened man looking for a place in the war effort, but that he is actually being sought after by the President and has already turned down at least one important post because it was not the kind of spot he wanted. The explanation offered for the President's action is that it is necessary to build up a strong coalition for the next presidential election, and that the wooing of Kennedy is chiefly a wooing of the important Catholic vote.

Joe Kennedy has a record as a capable organizer and would probably be a good man at the head of a war agency as far as the immediate job went. But the President should know from experience that it is inviting political treachery to surround himself with people who in the past have been the implacable enemies of his policies, either foreign or domestic. He has the bitter lesson of the New Deal-hating-dollar-a-year men to guide him.

### Jim Crow Women's Clubs

Query: When is a business or professional woman not a business or professional woman? Answer: When she is a Negro. Such at least is the conclusion we seem required to draw from a recent incident in New York. A group of women in that city, who earn their living through professional or business activities, formed a club and sought affiliation with the Business and Professional Women's Clubs of New York State, which is in turn part of a flourishing national organization of about 75,000 members.

A charter was issued to the new group and everything went swimmingly until the officers of the statewide organization discovered that among the members of the freshman body, called the Midtown Business and Professional Women's Club, there are two Negroes. Thereupon the machinery came to a grinding halt. The club was told that it was no longer a member of the statewide body and in fact that the charter granted had been "a clerical error." This seems odd in view of the fact that the dues of each member to the local, state and national bodies had been accepted and that each had received a membership card in the National Federation. The club which has been so unceremoniously turned out of doors has applied to the courts for relief and the outcome will be awaited with interest. A spokesman for the state organization says that the charge of race discrimination is false; that the group has contained Negro members as far back as 1919 and that the new club was rejected because the officials decided it would be a trouble-maker. No doubt the court action will clear up the whole matter. The national federation, we understand, publishes a lively magazine called *The Independent Woman*. We should be sorry to see its name changed, even in spirit, to "*The Independent Pure Aryan Superrace Woman*."

### A Good Man Gone

We record with deep regret the death of one of our most valuable contributors, George P. West of California. New Republic readers familiar with his articles, the latest of which appeared in our issue of March 1, do not need to be told that his was one of the clearest, sanest and most effective voices the American progressive movement possessed. He had been a newspaperman all his life, having worked in New York, Chicago and as a White House correspondent in Washington, but he was most widely known and did his best work in his beloved San Francisco. He will be sorely missed.

### The Two Wars

Mr. West's sudden death, of a heart attack, prevented him from making a comment in our pages which we know he would have wished to make. One passage in his article, "Mr. Roosevelt's Supreme Test," in our issue of February 8, has been misinterpreted by a number of people, some at least of whom ought to know better. Commenting on the proposal that a group of American progressives should present a memorial to President Roosevelt, urging him to stand fast for liberalism on the domestic front, Mr. West wrote:

It [the proposed memorial] should warn him [the President] that failure in the political field would be more damning and disastrous even than a failure to win a military victory. For the democratic cause could survive even an armed truce with Hitler better than it could survive betrayal by the leaders of Britain and America.

This statement has been interpreted as meaning that Mr. West was in favor of a negotiated peace, which is of course utter nonsense. What he was saying was that the war against fascism is bigger and more important than the war against Germany; and that if we were to turn fascist here at home we should have lost the chief of these two wars. Note that he did not say "peace with Hitler" but "an armed truce." His statement seems to us axiomatic; and we feel that it can be challenged in good faith only by those who, consciously or unconsciously, are quite prepared to accept fascism here at home—provided the native fascists will be obliging enough to call it something else.

### Slavery Conviction

Last week the Department of Justice obtained the second conviction in our history for violation of the federal anti-slavery statute. Alex Skrobarszyk and his daughter Susie were found guilty by a jury in Federal Court at Corpus Christi, Texas, of holding Alfred Irving, a Negro, as a slave. Alex was sentenced to four years in prison; Susie, to two years. The facts of the case revealed that the Skrobarszyks had behaved inhumanly toward Alfred Irving, had kept him chained in a henhouse when he was not working.

Last week's conviction was part of an announced program against peonage by the Attorney General's staff. Six other indictments are now pending. Last week one such indictment was returned against Donald Castle of Lauderdale, Mississippi, charging violation of federal anti-peonage and anti-slavery statutes. Castle is charged with having seized Rossy Wyse, a Negro, and forcing him at the point of a gun to Castle's sawmill to work off an alleged debt of \$20. It is especially significant and encouraging that the indictment against Castle was returned by a federal grand jury in the same Mississippi county where a white man was recently indicted under a lynching charge involving a Negro, *U. S. v. Holder*. Both of these cases are scheduled for early trial before the Federal District Court in Hattiesburg.

### Imported Farm Labor

Secretary Wickard reports that the Department of Agriculture is now going to permit the importation of some 5,000 farm laborers from the Bahamas, and that the policy of importing Mexican labor has been resumed. Six hundred Mexicans are leaving Mexico City in a special train for California and more are on the way. This represents a victory for the large growers of Florida and California, the operators of the "factories in the field," to quote the title of Carey McWilliams' book. It is Bahamans and Mexicans, considered "docile" labor, that the growers want. A vast reservoir of farm labor exists in the cotton states, 2,000,000 farm hands working on a cotton crop which could be dumped into the ocean, as has been said, without hurt-

ing the war effort. This perhaps is an exaggeration, but the cotton surplus is enormous and the broad, rich acres which are now growing the fiber are adding nothing to the solution of the food crisis but are freezing the greatest pool of farm labor in the country. A courageous policy by the Department of Agriculture to compel the conversion of large cotton areas, not merely token areas, to food production would have helped solve the crisis. Alternatively, the Department at least should have stood behind the Farm Security program of transporting surplus Southern farm labor to areas like Florida and California, with provisions for minimum wages and decent living conditions. Actually the large growers have opposed this program and many of them have gone on strike against it by refusing to sign the agreements with minimum guarantees. Now a crisis has arisen in areas like Florida and California, with crops waiting to be harvested, and therefore it seems "realism" to the Department to import this migratory labor. The growers are going to pay the minimum FSA requirements, but have still won their point by forcing the importation of foreign labor. The Department of Agriculture has given a measure of its weakness in yielding to the intransigent growers and permitting further importations of foreign labor instead of using the surplus in this country.

### Signs of the Times in Canada

Canada, which has lagged behind Great Britain and other dominions, notably New Zealand, as well as the United States, in her provisions for the social security of her people, has taken an important step forward with the introduction of a government-sponsored measure in the House of Commons to set up a nationwide health-insurance system. The plan would provide medical and dental services, cost of hospitalization and drugs for all Canadians, to be paid for by a combination of income contributions and public grants. The annual cost to adults with jobs would be about \$26 a year.

Ian Mackenzie, Minister of Pensions, has also recommended for study by the House a broad plan of social security of which the chief features are the establishment of minimum income standards (\$30 a month for single persons, \$45 for couples), payment of children's allowances of from \$8 to \$9 a month and the liberalizing of pensions. In her health plan Canada has apparently at a jump moved ahead of this country, which is still bedeviled by the reactionaries of the medical profession in its effort to work out the necessary broad measure for safeguarding public health. Neither Canadian plan has yet been adopted, of course. Canada will doubtless find the same sort of opposition, from the same interests, that Americans have encountered in this field. And she will be handicapped, in her late start, by the factors which so hampered us in the early days of the New Deal—absence of skilled and experienced administrators and adequate public understand-

ing of the program—a heritage in both cases of a long period of conservative inertia. But the Canadian proposals are encouraging signs of the times.

### Puerto Rico's Governor

The introduction in Congress, with administration support, of a measure to amend the territorial constitution under which Puerto Rico is ruled, to provide for the election of a governor by the people of the island, is welcome news. Puerto Rico has been under political subjection since it was discovered by Columbus in 1493. In that one fact lies sufficient explanation of the troubles of the island today. More immediately, the present difficulties, brought to a head by the pinch of war on the economy of a one-crop country dependent for survival on food brought to the island in today's dreadfully scarce ships, stems from the fact that the Puerto Rican resident commissioner in Washington is a member of one political party while the majority of the Puerto Rican legislature gives allegiance to a different one. The governor must cooperate with the legislative majority in order that island policies can be formulated and executed. Yet the governor, appointed by the President of the United States, occupying the dual role of President's representative and administrative head of the island government, is technically responsible to no one in Puerto Rico and hence is a convenient target for all parties. The first step toward a solution for Puerto Rico is the ending of the colonial status, as Governor Tugwell has repeatedly said.

### The Senate and the Tiger

POST-WAR THINKING from Congress is enough of a novelty to be news; and when it is the kind of post-war thinking embodied in the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution in the Senate, it is important news. What makes the drawing of the resolution of crucial importance is the place of the Senate in the creation of any peace settlement and any post-war world.

Our machinery of government, as compared with the British, is an unwieldy one in the conduct of large issues of foreign policy. The initiation of foreign policy is in the hands of the President; its ratification, when it comes to the final form of a treaty or other agreement, is in the hands of the Senate. To ratify a treaty, the Senate requires a two-thirds vote. Which means that at any time thirty-two Senators have a veto power over what the President and his advisers have shaped, and what a majority of the Senate and the nation may well want.

Thus we have a concentration of responsibility without a concentration of power. The President is supposed to be, as John Marshall once put it, "the sole organ of the nation in its external relations"; but the power to make the final decisions on those relations is

shared by him with the Senate. And if the two are not of one mind, we have a team of horses pulling in opposite directions and getting exactly nowhere.

The consequences are serious in two respects. The first is that, after winning the victory in this war, we may easily have a badly botched peace and reconstruction period. The record of peacemaking after our last three wars is not a good one. After the Civil War the peace became a struggle between President Johnson and the Senate radicals under Thaddeus Stevens, in which the President was almost ousted by impeachment proceedings and in which—whoever was the victor in the struggle—the cause of a sane and healthy reconstruction was certainly the victim. After the Spanish American War the treaty of peace squeezed through the Senate by the margin of just one vote. And after World War I the struggle between President Wilson and the Senate opposition led by Henry Cabot Lodge had the tragic consequence of leaving America out of the very structure of world order whose absence made World War II possible.

The second set of consequences is just as serious and even more pressing. It is that, given this record and this machinery of deadlock, our great allies in Britain and Russia and China cannot carry on any negotiations with our government looking toward a post-war settlement with any confidence that the results will not be repudiated by the Senate. This is especially serious at a time when the anti-administration majority in Congress is engaged in an open war with the President, as if to serve notice by implication to our allies that it is futile to count on America's help in shaping world peace.

It is in this context that the bi-party Senate resolution takes on its immense importance. It calls for American participation in a post-war United Nations structure, which will have limited but none the less real power. It calls for an international police force in the hands of the United Nations in order to put down future aggression. And it calls for other features of a more or less specific and utterly desirable character.

It would be of incalculable advantage to have the Senate go on record as desiring this sort of post-war world. It would mean that the President, in carrying on his conversations with our allies, would be strengthened by the world's knowledge that the Senate would back him up in commitments of this sort. It would mean that our allies would be working with us with some confidence and not wholly in the dark. It would mean that the future of America and the world would not revolve around a struggle for power between the President and the Senate. And it would mean that the common people of the world would be no end heartened by the knowledge that America, after helping to liberate the world from fascist tyranny, did not intend to abdicate the tasks of peace.

There are, of course, some dangers in the resolution. One is the danger that it will too quickly stir factional

debate in the Senate about post-war problems, and thus interfere with the conduct of the war itself. For that reason we should be reluctant to see it pushed unless there were a good chance of its passage. For that reason also, no doubt, when it was finally offered to the Senate it was under an agreement precluding immediate debate.

The second danger has to do with the prerogative powers of the presidency. It is essential for an office that is the most important in the world today that the President should retain his complete power over the initiation of foreign policy. Like his power as Commander-in-Chief, this power can brook no qualification in a world of total war and difficult peace. We feel confident that the sponsors of the Senate resolution have no intention of edging the President out of his role in shaping foreign policy up to the point of ratification, but had in mind only the smoothing of the path which the President and Senate have to tread together.

"If we do not all hang together," an American revolutionary slogan addressed to the states ran, "we shall all hang separately." That is true to the anti-fascist nations of the world today. There is a tiger that burns bright in the forest of the night. It is the tiger of national hostility and power politics and ultimately of war again, waiting for us in the night of world chaos. If we do not clasp hands with Russia and Britain and China now, in the firm grip of a United Nations post-war world, only the tiger can be the victor.

## Support the Labor Board!

THE NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD is a keystone in the economic war structure. It embodies the agreement between responsible labor leaders and employers to countenance no voluntary interruption of production. Scarcely less important, it is an instrument of the national need both to do justice to labor's requirements and to permit no inflationary influence on prices from uncontrolled wage increases. Both these functions are now in peril; indeed, the board itself may crack and crumble under the terrific strain to which it is being subjected. It is of the utmost importance to all concerned that the board survive this crisis unimpaired.

Organized labor as a whole is demanding that the board abandon the Little Steel formula. This formula permitted increases in wage rates not to exceed 15 percent above the base period, the cost of living having risen by that amount when it was adopted. The cost of living has now increased an additional five percent at least, and still is going up. The unions thus have what superficially looks like a good case for the demand. Employer and public members of the board, however, are reluctant to grant it, in view of the national policy to hold the line against any inflationary tendency. For this stand they are denounced by the labor members,

who charge that they are allowing Mr. Byrnes to dictate their decision instead of following the logic of their former position and using their own judgment.

At the same time the United Mine Workers are demanding an increase of two dollars a day and other concessions, in collective bargaining with the operators. John L. Lewis, who destroyed the predecessor of this board when it refused to grant a former demand, is apparently trying not merely to get for the miners what they want but to wreck the conciliation machinery and the war economic control, without any concern over possible inflation or interruption of production. He makes no bones about threatening a strike if the increase is not granted, and is using every means of undermining the board's authority in advance, apparently with the intention of escaping its jurisdiction. Nothing would please him better than to arouse organized labor to open revolt against the administration and its conduct of the economic front, no matter what the consequences to victory or the country, to say nothing of the consequences to the labor movement itself.

The worst of it is that if either the more moderate leaders or Mr. Lewis prevail in this struggle, the rank and file of labor will gain nothing immediately and will lose in the long run. While in ordinary times the traditional formula of wage increases to match increases in the cost of living is completely justified, its application under present circumstances cannot enlarge the workers' consumption of goods. Their actual incomes have risen far more than the cost of living, because of full employment, overtime work and overtime pay. The rises in prices have occurred mainly in food, but most workers could not buy any more food if they had more money, because there is not enough food available to supply a larger demand. Much of it has to be rationed anyway. Indeed, the enlarged purchasing power of industrial wage-earners is one of the chief factors in the rise in food prices. More pay, if it were not put into war bonds or hoarded, would serve only to intensify the strain on ceiling prices and to encourage black markets. Meanwhile it would make certain the victory of the farm bloc in attempting to enforce by legislation the payment of still higher prices to the farmers.

Many union leaders understand that labor has nothing to gain and everything to lose by such a merry-go-round of prices. Out of this understanding has come the proposal on the part of certain unions, for example the electrical workers, that wage increases to match the rise in the cost of living be paid in war bonds, not to be converted into cash unless at the end of a stipulated period the announced anti-inflation policy of the government shall have been proved ineffectual. What most of the responsible leaders really want is not higher wages and higher prices but a genuine ceiling on the cost of living. Yet they cannot be expected to withstand the pressure of their rank and file for

action if the cost of living keeps on rising. Their present attitude differs in aim and spirit from that of Mr. Lewis, and may be taken as in effect a dramatization of the fact that Congress and the administration together are failing to enforce the President's seven-point anti-inflation program.

This is a crisis which can be survived only by statesmanship of a high order. It will not do simply to urge the board to stand pat while doing nothing to extricate it from an increasingly untenable position. It will not do merely to offer counsels of logic and patriotism to organized labor while Congress and the farm bloc deliberately invite inflation with a tax muddle and a progressive undermining of price stabilization. If the government is not to surrender to John L. Lewis, it will have a fight on its hands in which it will need the support of an impregnable just position and the tacit sympathy of the rest of the labor movement. At present it has neither; organized labor, however much against its will, is being pushed in Mr. Lewis' direction by the predacious politicians in Congress.

What is called for, in our opinion, is a bold move by the President before the crisis becomes any more acute. He cannot of course control Congress directly, and he cannot stop price increases or levy taxes by dictatorial action. But he can tell the people frankly what the situation is and what needs to be done to remedy it. He can point out who is obstructing the anti-inflation program, and by what measures. He can predict the consequences if it fails. He can ask labor for forbearance for a definite additional period, while the country has a chance to prove whether it really means to prevent inflation or not. And on this basis he can, relying on his own constitutional authority and the real power in his hands, warn Mr. Lewis that, whatever happens, no interruption of coal production will be permitted. By these measures he can be forearmed for any challenge to governmental authority which Mr. Lewis may be foolhardy enough to make.

## THE NEW REPUBLIC

### *A Journal of Opinion*

**Editors:** BRUCE BLIVEN, MALCOLM COWLEY, GEORGE SOULE, MICHAEL STRAIGHT, STARK YOUNG

**Managing Editor:** THOMAS SANCTON

**Treasurer:** DANIEL MEBANE

**Assistant Editors:** BYRON DEXTER, VARIAN FRY, ELIZABETH HULING

**Contributing Editors:** H. N. BRAILSFORD, VAN WYCK BROOKS, JULIAN HUXLEY, ALFRED KAZIN, MAX LERNER, E. C. LINDEMAN, REXFORD GUY TUGWELL

**Advertising Manager:** E. G. WOOD

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION, SIX DOLLARS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

# Inside Russia

**F**OR SOME WEEKS NOW the two great Moscow dailies, *Izvestia* and *Pravda*, have been reaching New York with a fair degree of regularity, and are only two or three months old when they arrive. An account of what, in these tense, heroic days, the Muscovite finds in his morning paper should give, however indirectly and imperfectly, a glimpse of the Soviet scene. One would get more of a picture if one could also examine the daily published for the *Komsomol* youth, the army gazette, *Red Star*, and a few other papers of a special nature issued once or twice a week, but unfortunately these are not available.

As everybody knows, *Pravda* (Truth) is sponsored by the Communist Party, while the other paper is nominally the organ of the government: the *Bulletin* (*Izvestia*) of the Workers' Soviets of the Soviet Union. In *Pravda*, not unnaturally, there is a certain emphasis on party matters. For the rest, the two publications are scarcely distinguishable. Being mouth-pieces of the state and of the party which is behind it, they carry enormous prestige and are said to have a circulation of more than two million each. Judged by American standards, they are, however, not impressive physically. An issue of either never ran to more than eight pages, and since the war it is only four pages, except on great occasions, such as the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Revolution.

A surprisingly small amount of this limited space is devoted to straight news. The official morning and evening communiqués are usually among the first items to meet the eye. Front-page matter may also include such an announcement as this: "As a result of the pre-October socialist competition and the adoption of Stakhanovite methods, the bauxite mines of the South Ural Region completed their assigned quota for the year on October 15." It should be explained that in order to step up production, in connection with the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the "October" Revolution, which took place on November 7, 1942, contests were instituted in which mills, factories, railways, the collective farms, or *kolkhozes*, and indeed entire republics, participated. The winning unit received a red banner, a "traveling" flag which passed on like a trophy to the next champion, as well as a bonus. These contests were taken very seriously and were an effective stimulus to the war effort.

Other news items, many of them from the production front, are scattered on the second and third pages, while the fourth page may contain some foreign news. Though its scope is global, this is decidedly meager. The speeches of Roosevelt, Churchill and Willkie are given, but in abridged form. The *New Republic* comment on Willkie's speech demanding a second front

was noted in *Pravda* for October 6. The news of the Shostakovich concert which took place in Carnegie Hall on October 13 was given at least as much space as the day's operations in the Far East.

The print may be broken up now and then by a cartoon or a photograph, say of a group of snipers, the harvesting of the sugar beets in a Siberian *kolkhoz*, a crowd of factory hands listening to a speech by Stalin as it comes over the radio. But there are no comic strips, no crossword puzzles, no murder mysteries, no obituaries, no nature notes, no menus, no fashion plates. And of course no advertisements. Theatrical performances, films and concerts are merely listed in the briefest possible way at the bottom of the last page. Books and films are given short notices, and sometimes a foreign volume is reviewed, such as Lt.-Colonel Kernan's "Defense Will Not Win the War." Occasionally there is a notice such as the one of a lecture on the international situation delivered under the auspices of the Section of Propaganda and Agitation of the Moscow Committee of the Party. Or there may be a list of the winning numbers of the bonds in the latest state lottery.

The fact is that the function of a newspaper in the Soviet scheme of things is not primarily to inform, and least of all to entertain, but rather to indoctrinate, to persuade, to inspire, to impel toward action. The tone of exhortation strikes home the moment one unfolds the paper. Flanking the masthead, where one might expect a headline announcing the capture of an important center, or a conference of Allied leaders, one often finds instead a word of encouragement for the fighting soldiers and citizens, a denunciation of the enemy, a brief, forceful appeal, a slogan. Indeed, slogans top other pages as well. These headlines are apt to be pronouncements of Stalin. For days after the anniversary the papers were plastered with excerpts from the speech he made on that occasion at the solemn session of the Moscow Soviet. Prior to that, the editors drew upon slogans furnished for the anniversary by the party. On November 1 *Izvestia* displayed these lines: "Guardsmen of the Red Army and of the Navy! Carry your banners with honor! Be examples of valor and daring, of discipline and steadfastness, in the struggle with the enemy! Long live the Soviet Guard!" On the same day *Pravda*'s injunction ran as follows: "Workers of the Soviet Union! During the twenty-five years of Soviet power you have created a mighty industrial and *kolkhoz* State. Defend the fruits of your many years of labor with all your strength!"

A slogan is also apt to head a solid block of type on the left-hand side of the front page: the editorial. The *Izvestia* leaders do not differ from those in *Pravda*. Indeed, one might listen to them blindfolded and not

be able to say in which paper they had appeared. In fact, on October 6 the only difference in the headings of the editorials was that *Izvestia* used the word "tasks" where *Pravda* used the word "assignments" and the substance of both leaders was of course the same, as is not seldom the case. As often as not, the editorial is a homily on a text taken from some official declaration. It is apt to deal with such matters as the need for growing more potatoes and vegetables, for increasing the efficiency of transportation or for developing character in the young. It goes without saying that military topics are frequently touched upon. Thus there will be an editorial on "The Commander's Honor," a phrase occurring in a decree of the Supreme Soviet. The Commander is reminded that his honor comprises that of all the men under him, that with the abolition of political commissars, his responsibility has increased. It is not enough for him to have personal courage: he must hold his unit together by iron discipline and at the same time must be to his men a father and a mentor, watching over their morale and working for their political enlightenment. He must educate his men in the understanding of "the noble, sacred tasks of the Patriotic War." The term, it should be noted, was earlier applied to the war against Napoleon. It may also be pointed out that the word "sacred" crops up with increasing frequency in Soviet oratory.

Absent from these leaders is any criticism of the authorities at home and indeed even of the conduct of the war by the Allies. Some does creep into the reports from the home front, particularly from the provinces and oftenest on the subject of production. These communications sometimes come not from reporters but from men holding responsible positions in the government or the party. The chief of the State Petroleum Inspection of the main petroleum trust, attached to the Council of the People's Commissars, has some unpleasant things to say about the waste of fuel in certain plants. The secretary of the Yakut Regional Committee of the party commends Yakutia's contribution to the war effort but points out that there is room for improvement. Again, inefficiency in coal production in the Bulanash Region, in the heart of the Urals, is denounced, and the dirty sties and stables in the "Red Hero" kolkhozes of the Pugachov Region, east of the Volga, are called to public attention. "Wasters of electric power must be punished" is the heading of an item in which specific charges are made and names named and which is signed by the chief engineer of Energosbyt. A communication from a provincial center charged neglect of soldiers' dependents. In this connection it may be noted that a dispatch from Moscow, dated January 28 and appearing in *The New York Times*, announced the dismissal of the Commissar for Social Services in the RSFSR for having permitted her subordinates to employ "heartlessly bureaucratic methods towards the dependents of fighting men."

The record of achievement is much more prominently displayed than accounts of shortcomings. In the October and November issues of both papers a great deal of space was devoted to lists of plants and other institutions that had won the championship of the pre-October socialist competition already mentioned. Obviously the Soviet government believes in the efficacy of public honors as an incentive to working and fighting. On May 20, 1942, the Order of the Patriotic War of the first and second degrees was added to the many orders already in existence. The next day another decree introduced badges to be worn by men who had achieved excellence in the various arms of the service. At the end of July three new orders were created exclusively for the Red Army command: the Order of Suvorov of the first, second and third degrees; the Order of Kutuzov of the first and second degrees; the order of Alexander Nevsky, a thirteenth-century prince canonized by the Church, who owed his surname to having triumphed over the Swedes near the Neva but is now remembered chiefly as the warrior who defeated the Teutonic Knights. From the beginning of the war up to June 9, 1942, decorations were conferred on 117,982 members of the armed forces of the Union. The number of guerrilla fighters decorated was even larger. Apparently all of these men had their names in the papers. So did the civilians honored for distinguished services to their country. So did the soldiers and sailors who received promotion. So did the composers, actors, painters and sculptors who were elevated to the rank of "Distinguished Artist." During the past year not infrequently an issue would contain little besides the list of the recipients of such honors.

Prior to June 9, 1942, the title of "Hero of the Soviet Union" was conferred upon 242 persons. The papers are crammed with stirring accounts showing the resourcefulness, the skill, above all, the more than human valor of the Red Army fighters and medical personnel. The stories are written by special correspondents, among whom are not a few well known writers, such as the novelist, Ehrenburg, and the poet, Tikhonov. The latter remained in Leningrad and continued to send dispatches and feature stories throughout the siege. The papers also carry reports of the feats of the guerrillas and of the stubborn resistance offered by the population in the occupied territory. The issue of *Pravda* for November 1, 1942, carried a long article by the secretary of the Crimean Regional Committee of the party on conditions in occupied Crimea, chiefly on guerrilla activities there. He noted that there were many communist cells in the guerrilla bands and that the number of communists in the detachments had recently increased by 150. The fact that a man who shows exceptional prowess is a party member is of course brought to the reader's attention, but as often, if not oftener, it is the unaffiliated citizen and soldier who is the hero. The villain, who rarely appears on

the scene, is apt to be a former kulak. The Trotskyite seems to be out of the picture. These stories are likely to be not mere factual reporting, but narratives written with an eye to drama, and not without touches of rhetoric, which may nevertheless be the product of genuine feeling. "The shadows of heroic ancestors loom above the dazzling peaks of the Caucasus," concludes a piece on how Georgians fight, "and the rivers that dash down their flanks carry their summons to the hearts of our fearless fighters. Forward, Georgians! The song rings from the mountains!"

There is an abundance of human-interest stories. One of them has to do with a group of school children who decide to surrender the candy they receive at lunch-time to the soldiers at the front. Another is about a home for war orphans, some of whom are motherless children with fathers in the army. The writer's object is to reassure those fathers as to the care their children are receiving. Incidentally we learn that in the course of nine months about 4,500 orphans have been adopted in Moscow alone. Some of the foster-parents were soldiers and sailors who had lost their own families. A seaman stationed in a Pacific port wrote to the orphanage: "In view of the circumstances obtaining today, I have made up my mind to take a daughter under my care. Until the end of the war I obligate myself to send money for her support and after the war I will take her to live with me permanently. I beg you to find for me a beloved daughter whose mother and father have perished from the Hitlerite plague. The child will not be harmed in any way."

One passage in this article runs: "When a child has been deprived of his mother by the enemy, the only thing you can do for that child is to avenge him, and this right to avenge belongs to you who are fighting at the front." Not infrequently the moral of the tale is pointed thus and takes the form of an explicit injunction. Tikhonov, in the course of a brief piece, quotes from an order found on a dead German sergeant to the effect that "The civilian population is not to be spared," and concludes with this admonition: "Remember that, soldier of the Red Army, and take aim more carefully: remember, when you dispatch another Hans you save the lives of Soviet men and women, you clear your native land!" Slavin, another correspondent who is a writer of some note, after describing the treacherous tricks to which the enemy resorts, thus apostrophizes the Red Army soldier: "Do not believe the Hitlerite with regard to anything! Do not be fooled by his ruses! Strike him without mercy and without end! Strike him as you alone in the whole world know how to strike! Strike him on the head, in the side, in the back, but strike him! And he will run."

In addition to the feature stories, a considerable proportion of the limited space is given to fiction and

verse. Recently an entire novel was serialized in Pravda. Late in August the same paper printed in full the text of the drama, "The Front," by Korneichuk, which subsequently played to crowded houses all over the country. Verse, as well as prose, is in part the work of combatants. Tvardovsky, a talented young poet, composed a somewhat Kiplingesque trench ballad about a good soldier whose ability to crack a joke under any circumstances won him the affection of all his comrades. For the most part, however, newspaper verse is serious: praising bravery, calling for vengeance, cursing the enemy. The inexhaustible versifier, Demyan Bedny, after suffering an eclipse, has come back with a piece innocent of understatement which ends: "Death to the blood-suckers and man-eaters!" In the Soviet scheme of values, literature has always been a force to reckon with and an instrumentality to be used for the achievement of definite ends. The verse and the fiction, like the news stories, are plainly there to build morale. The same is true of most of the other items that go into the papers. The centenary of the death of the peasant poet Koltzov offered an opportunity for the remark, in an article in Pravda of November 11, that a people which could produce such a manly and buoyant poet was a victorious people.

"You cannot defeat an enemy without having learned to hate him from the bottom of your heart." The spirit of this excerpt from Stalin's May Day Order animates much of the writing in the newspapers, as elsewhere. One gets the impression that hatred of the invader is only matched in intensity by the emotion of patriotism. The phrases about a total war, a people's war, fought by a united nation straining every muscle to protect its precious heritage, to save its own, lose their triteness as one thumbs these closely printed pages. There is a new reverence for the past, a recrudescence of national pride, a fond exaltation of native traditions. At the same time there is an effort to foster "the indestructible friendship of the peoples of the USSR," as the official formula has it. The contribution to the war effort of the various national minorities is emphasized on every occasion. Practically half of the issue of Pravda for October 31 is given over to a letter addressed by the people of Uzbekistan (a central Asiatic republic inhabited by an ethnic group of Turco-Tataric stock) to their "beloved children" at the front. Nearly 2,500,000 signatures to this lengthy message were obtained. Couched in a florid Oriental style, it is like other Soviet pronouncements, however, in that it contains a quotation from Stalin. The Uzbek soldiers are urged to stand firm, to spare neither life nor limb, to "be brave as lions," to "cut off the bloody paw of the monster who reaches out for Uzbekistan." The letter ends by hailing "the glorious patriots of the Soviet fatherland, the glorious sons of the Uzbek people" and "our great general, leader and very own father, Stalin!"

To judge by the papers, the war has greatly enhanced Stalin's role as the living personification of the country and what it stands for. Alike to the primitive-minded and the more sophisticated, he is the father-image, stern, revered, trusted. At a conference of crack snipers held in the woods somewhere near the front, a sharpshooter from Kazakhstan is reported to have made this speech: "I've shot thirty-eight. I'll shoot more. I'll shoot until we've chased them out of our country. And when we have killed all of them, we'll come to Father Stalin and say: 'Father Stalin, you gave us the word. We took it to heart and did what you told us, and now we bring you victory.' Father Stalin will say: 'Good. Fascism is done for.'" In an address presented to Stalin by the Moscow Soviet on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Revolution, he is told: "A year ago the German hordes were pushing on toward Moscow in order to seize our beloved capital. The workers of Moscow swore to you then, dear Comrade Stalin, without sparing their lives to defend our glorious capital from the German aggressors. . . . Today the workers of Moscow and the entire Soviet people swear to you, our beloved father and leader, to do our utmost . . . to perform the historic task of repelling and crushing the enemy."

On the same occasion Stalin made a speech which was not only printed in all the papers and periodicals but was also issued separately in an edition of 10,000,000 copies, and which, we are told, met with the proper response everywhere. Writing in *Izvestia*, Vladimir Lidin, a novelist of some reputation, declared: "We know: when the familiar voice of Stalin is heard over the microphone it is always a pre-determination of the road. . . . Always after a speech of his things took their proper places, and we knew: a keen, precise intellect holds vigil over the country; a colossal passionate will defends the country; a big man leads the country. . . . After hearing Stalin's words the workman would begin his day with greater determination; the scientist would sense in a new way the nature of things in the world that he was studying; the fighter of the Red Army defending the country would see his task in a new light."

Perhaps the most emphatic expression of the apotheosis of Stalin occurs in an article published last summer in *Propagandist*, the bi-monthly organ of the party, and written by Yaroslavsky, formerly the leader of the now abandoned anti-religious campaign. Here the author holds Stalin up as the embodiment of everything connected with the concept of the Fatherland:

Comrade Stalin is our Party,  
Comrade Stalin is our people,  
Comrade Stalin is our banner,  
Comrade Stalin is our victory.

The anniversary of the Revolution was marked, among other things, by the publication of several news-

paper articles on the achievements and significance of the quarter of a century just ended. The general tenor of these comments was that Lenin's and Stalin's wise policy of industrialization and collectivization had enabled the country to resist the enemy and would eventually bring victory, and further that the unexampled heroism shown by the people was the result of the education that the party had given them. Tikhonov contributed to *Izvestia* an impassioned paean to Leningrad, the place where "mankind's Spring" began. "The fascists," he wrote from the beleaguered city, "are camped outside Leningrad. They have strong positions, strong artillery, planes, tanks. But there is something stronger, of which they have no understanding. It is the strength of a great people awakened by the October Revolution. This people will never be enslaved." He concluded: "The road along which October led the peoples of our land will again be cleared of debris and corpses, and we shall go on along this road to a new blossoming of a peaceful socialist society. The foe stopped our peaceful labors. We beat our plowshare into a sword. With this sword we shall pierce the breast of the enemy and strike him dead."

Ehrenburg's remarks in *Pravda*, entitled "The Meaning of Russia," on the same occasion, expressed the viewpoint that the Revolution had come not to destroy but to fulfill the law, and were particularly interesting for the curious neo-populist note that they struck. Soviet Russia, he argued there, was "inextricably linked with the democracies of the West," yet it cherished its heritage and its distinct identity. Europe first met Russia on the field of Borodino and there discovered what a strong and noble heart was beating under the sheepskin coat. *Narod* (the people) had always been the leading theme of Russian history. After the October Revolution the people "became Russia itself." Humanity has ever been the distinguishing trait of the Russian people: "from the saints of old to the nihilists, from the Virgin, in the apocryphal tale, descending into hell to suffer with the damned, down to Tolstoy, Chekhov and Gorky, from the men of ancient Novgorod to the defenders of Stalingrad." Indeed, Ehrenburg declares, the Soviet state is the first to be based not upon a reckoning of rights and duties but "on the high principle of comradeship."

He goes on to stress not the material, but the spiritual factor, "the strength of the warrior's soul," in accounting for the repulse of the Germans before Moscow and for the epic of Stalingrad. Likewise, he insists, "the October Revolution was not only the outcome of the industrialization of Russia, but the fulfillment of an age-old dream of the Russian people." They had always revered labor, and this new state, "built upon the exaltation of labor, is the legendary Kitezh [that invisible mystic city whose bells are heard only by the elect], of which the people have always been in search." He winds up, after the usual

tribute to Stalin, by quoting from a poem of Tyutchev's written at the time of the Crimean War. Incidentally, this excellent poet was a reactionary diplomat who pictured the empire of Nicholas I as a sacred ark destined alone to breast the revolutionary flood. "Oh, native land," run the lines that Ehrenburg cites, "such an array of foes/Has not been seen since primal days!/ Your meaning, then, oh, Russia, must be great/Be brave, stand firm, and victory is yours!"

Proletarian internationalism, however, has not en-

tirely disappeared from the Soviet press. One vestige of it remains. Printed above the title of Pravda is the motto, in Russian: "Proletarians of all lands, unite!" and the same summons, in small type, appears over the masthead of Izvestia in sixteen languages, chosen from among those spoken in the Union. It should be added that in the issues of Red Star for February, 1942, the only ones available here, the motto has been displaced by the slogan: "Death to the German invaders!"

AVRAHM YARMOLINSKY

## Meat-Axing Manpower

**M**ANPOWER is people first and statistics afterwards. We might keep this in mind as we grab for the meat-axe to go to work on the problem. Senator La Follette deserves the credit for the meat-axe analogy though no credit for his support of the measure to which he applied it—the Bankhead amendment to the Selective Service Act which would exempt all farm workers from the draft while indenturing them to their present riding bosses for the duration. Bob La Follette is one man who should know that, once we start swinging the meat-axe on the toughest human problem that American democracy has ever faced, there is no stopping. We are committed to the meat-axe from there on out.

For if no more farm workers can be spared to the armed forces and industry, what about the transport workers who get farm products to market? Senator Downey predicts "food riots and famine in the fertile state of California" unless this group also is covered by the Bankhead amendment. Are farm and transport workers, then, the only ones who must be frozen lest the populace riotously starve? By no means. The food processors in stockyards, canneries, packing houses, flour mills, bakeries, spring immediately to mind. And the food distributors. They too must stay on the job to keep the people from perishing. The War Manpower Commission has just received a long memorial from the grocery clerks of San Francisco petitioning that they be declared in a "critical occupation" and blanketed out of the draft.

Don't think the industrialists aren't cocking their best ear toward the congressional clamor. They aren't likely to let the farm bloc steal a march on them. We shall soon hear that not a worker can be released from the aluminum and magnesium industry. And so on—and on. The meat-axe approach, as can be quickly seen, opens vistas of manpower chaos far more frightful than that in which we now live and move.

The alternative to the meat-axe is what? Another meat-axe, booms the Wall Street voice of the Citizens' Committee for a National Service Act out of innumerable loudspeakers planted in the provinces. The in-

terests back of the irrepressible Austin-Wadsworth proposal for a universal labor draft are capitalizing on the hysteria being worked up by the holy show on the Hill. They figure that the people, together with their representatives, will become so terrified by the apparition of a total manpower breakdown now being conjured up in Congress that they will shout for the potent magic of a labor draft law to exorcise it.

Under the Austin-Wadsworth national-service bill the burden of administration would be placed in the hands of the local draft boards which have neither the facilities nor the vision to handle so colossal a job as dispatching all of America's men and women to their proper niches in the overall production scheme—assuming we some day get such a scheme. What the corporation lawyers who drew the bill had really in mind was to meat-axe labor with it. No safeguards concerning wages and working conditions are written in: the bill slyly provides that a labor volunteer or draftee "shall receive the compensation and work the hours applicable to the kind of work which he or she is required to perform in the place of employment to which he or she is assigned." Thus the bill would guarantee a plentiful supply of workers to gyp-employers who are now having difficulty in getting labor on account of substandard wages and working conditions. Even more significant than the bill itself, perhaps, is an amendment which would "protect" both volunteers and draftees against having to join any labor organization. This union-busting provision was too raw to incorporate in the original text of the bill which was printed in the papers, though it was integral and was eased back in.

The Austin-Wadsworth bill would do nothing to correct the crying manpower abuse of the day—underutilization of labor by employers, both farm and industrial. The extent of this under-utilization has been covered up by the military secrecy which cloaks the employment figures of individual war plants, though on the farm side we know that 2,000,000 seasonal agricultural workers are idle more than half the time while 2,000,000 man-years will be squandered in the production of the 1943 short-staple-cotton crop—which

could all be dumped into the Gulf of Mexico without harm to the war effort, according to Theodore W. Schultz, agricultural economist of Iowa State.

The picture of labor under-utilization in industry can be glimpsed only through occasional holes in the overcast of secrecy and hush-up. One huge hoard of labor that should be broken up is in textiles, the CIO estimating that 250,000 workers could be released to other industries, principally from the South where the oversupply has kept wage rates and union organization down. Among war industries, the most scandalous situation that has come to light is the overstocking of labor indulged in by the Pacific Coast shipyards. The Industrial Union of Marine and Shipyard Workers (CIO) estimates that there are five or six workers for every three jobs in the Western yards. Shipyard workers in the San Francisco Bay area tell of using their tools only two or three hours out of every shift—day after day and week after week. One yard recently went over from a cost-plus to a so-much-per-ship basis and at once let out a "surplus" of 2,500 workers who had somehow escaped notice when their wages went to swell the shipyard's profits. The vaunted Kaiser method of keeping each steel plate constantly in motion from the flatcar till it is bucked and welded into place in the hull is inordinately wasteful of labor. Keeping the steel moving means men must cool their heels by the hundreds waiting for it to show up. Steel and time are alike invaluable, but men in these days have become equally so.

Persistent stories indicate that labor wastage—attributable to poor management, faulty scheduling, material shortages and outright hoarding—is enormous in aircraft, ordnance and other war industries. Walter P. Reuther of the United Automobile Workers declares in a statement recently submitted to the WMC that "full employment of the 700,000 war workers in the Detroit area on a forty-eight-hour-week basis would give Detroit war industries an equivalent of 40,000 additional trained war workers. Failure to provide full employment is causing approximately 2,000,000 man-hours to be wasted in the Detroit area *each week*. This is more man-hours than have been lost in all the strikes in this area during the past *year*." Reuther buttresses his statement with appalling illustrations from many plants. Typical is the story of the Olds Motor Works at Lansing.

The Olds Works employed 6,000 before conversion to the manufacture of 20-mm. aircraft cannon. After conversion, employment was stepped up to 10,000. A vigorous and successful labor-management production drive resulted in an output 500 percent greater than the quota assigned. This magnificent record won for the plant and its workers the Army-Navy E. Immediately thereafter the work-week was reduced to five days, then down to four and even three as production schedules were drastically cut back by the Ordnance

Department. At present the Olds workers are making five and six days a week, having learned that all-out production doesn't pay.

A further range of manpower waste includes the minorities. The effort to get full use of America's 13,000,000 Negroes collapsed with the shelving of the President's Fair Employment Practice Committee. Among Negroes are 600,000 unemployed out of our grand total of less than 1,500,000. Negroes in war industries are generally working below their levels of actual or potential skill. Negroes aren't getting trained in sufficient numbers for future war jobs. More than half the Negro trainees live in states which contain less than a fifth of the total Negro population. The armed forces are parties to fearful waste with regard to the Negroes. The army, having largely excluded them from combat units, can't think what to do with them and has consequently fallen far behind in the induction of Negroes. The numbers of 300,000 Negroes are up, but unwitting white substitutes are going in their places because of the army's blockhead notion that Negroes won't make real soldiers.

Prejudice as usual is costing us dearly in under-utilization of Jews, Mexicans, aliens. The rigmarole prescribed by the Army Provost Marshal for clearance of aliens to work in war plants is so fantastically involved and time-consuming that few are cleared and a great reserve of overwhelmingly loyal manpower is frittered away.

The WMC, stalled by Congress and its own aversion to grabbing hold of anything politically hot, is doing almost nothing to stop labor-wasting and hoarding. It won't even lay the facts on the line and let those do something who can. The last WMC appropriation came through with a rider specifying that future employees earning more than \$4,500 a year would be subject to senatorial confirmation. This provision has bogged and intimidated the WMC worse than ever and gives us a preview of what the pernicious McKellar bill—which would extend a similar requirement to the entire executive department—would accomplish by way of sabotaging the government. Among the WMC appointees whose names are waiting for the senatorial nod is Frank H. Sparks, president of an Indiana college, who is McNutt's selection to head a Bureau of Labor Utilization. When Sparks is confirmed—assuming that he is eventually confirmed—he will be faced with the job of building an organization, most of whose members if they are to be of the caliber needed, will in turn require confirmation. This will take many months. We can therefore expect little action on labor utilization out of the WMC in time to do any good.

The one substantial and creative achievement which stands out from almost a year of WMC fumbling on the manpower problem is the establishment of labor-stabilization plans for some forty-five areas. These

plans, based on coöperation between labor and management on the local level to reduce labor waste, are the reverse of the meat-axe approach. They release the energies and the capability for constructive labor-use planning inherent in the people who are most closely concerned with the problems to be solved. While these plans have not been put into effect with uniform good faith, they have shown in Baltimore, Louisville, Cleveland, Akron, and to a lesser degree in other war-production centers, that this is the right way to tackle such obvious manpower wastage as excessive turnover, absenteeism, piracy, multiple hiring and unnecessary in-migration.

Despite this revelation of what can be accomplished through enlisting the voluntary support and assistance of organized labor—not to speak of the British example along these lines—our manpower agency utilizes labor officials only in advisory, never in operating capacities. In place of a Bevin we have a McNutt. Really running the show as WMC executive director is Lawrence A. Appley, promoter of a patent nostrum, Vick's Vaporub. This is the pattern throughout the WMC—politicians, business and advertising men, Hoosier professors, industrial-personnel directors, a sprinkling of social workers and a horde of "analysts" whose diet of experience has been principally the thin gruel of statistics. This in the main is why our manpower policy has been so ineffective. The politicians have responded to "heat" from their brethren in the trade. The business men and industrial-relations counselors have played ball with recalcitrant employers and connived at labor waste. The professors have kidded the public with Hoosier homilies and that disarming benignity which comes to flower along the banks of the Wabash. The social workers have dressed windows and the analysts have given us voluminous tables and jargon when we needed the spur of plain talk.

That there are real manpower shortages in certain industries is undeniable. Non-ferrous mining is one. The much publicized "shutting down of the gold mines" was effected to get men experienced in underground mining out of gold into copper, lead and zinc. Nine thousand were released, but of these only 3,000 were underground miners, the remainder being men off gold-dredging operations who knew less about underground work than New York subway-riders. These 3,000 came from the Homestake mine in South Dakota and the Golden Cycle in Colorado, the only gold mines that were closed. So far as is known, only 1,100 of these actually turned up in non-ferrous mining, a substantial number being hired by other gold mines—which were never shut down, on the specious ground that they produced by-products which have some insignificant war use.

Another example of a genuine manpower shortage is in the Pacific Northwest lumber industry. Lack of

lumber is already delaying operations in shipyards, aircraft plants and other war establishments. The situation promises to deteriorate, with the most optimistic predictions matching a national lumber production of 29,000,000,000 board feet against estimated minimum consumption of 31,000,000,000 in 1943. Washington and Oregon operators say they are short 6,000 experienced loggers in the woods. It is known that at least 6,000 former riggers, fallers and buckers could be assembled from the shipyards of Seattle and Portland. The meat-axe method would compel this 6,000 to return to the woods, though the loggers, with their IWW tradition, would probably do some meat-axing in return. The Lumber and Sawmill Workers (AFL) and the International Woodworkers (CIO) maintain that the 6,000 could be induced to go back to the woods voluntarily if the lumber companies would regularize their operations at capacity levels and guarantee stand-by pay for days lost on account of rain, snow and fire hazard.

The lumber companies, of course, won't budge. Last September Donald M. Nelson ordered them to go on a forty-eight-hour week. There was great dragging of feet in the execution of this order, some companies going over to forty-eight hours and then cutting back, some not having complied to this day. Nelson's order, like many another of the kind issued from Washington, was never followed up and enforced. The operators would like to get some of the army's surplus Negro labor battalions marched into the woods to solve their problem—the first idea being to start them in Alaska on Sitka spruce. The motive of course would be to smash the unions, which have 90 percent of the loggers organized, and to beat down wage scales. Unskilled troops would be almost useless as workers in the highly mechanized logging operations of the Northwest—though the risk of the work, even for experienced loggers, approaches that of an active battlefield.

The WMC has told us that our total labor force must be expanded by 6,400,000 workers in 1943. The armed forces will take the lion's share—4,300,000—the munitions industries 1,800,000 and essential civilian industries 300,000. Obviously the job will be largely one of replacing those going into the armed forces. The WMC estimates that 500,000 of the total required will come from the ranks of the unemployed, 2,700,000 will be women, while the remaining 3,200,000 must be drawn from non-essential industries. A universal forty-eight-hour week should reduce the latter figure by 500,000.

These 6,400,000 additional workers can be recruited—but not through the meat-axe approach, which will only paralyze the coöperative processes needed to effect so great a transformation of our ways of working. The big thing that needs to be done right now is not to pass laws but to pull labor into a more responsible role in

the manpower program. Labor should be closely involved in manpower administration and operation and not be restricted to merely advisory functions. On plant levels, labor-management committees should be formed where they do not now exist while the "paper"

committees which make up the great majority of the 2,000 now in existence should be brought to life. Once the full cooperation of the people who are manpower is thus obtained, the statistics will pretty well take care of themselves.

JOHN BEECHER

## The Anti-Fourth Term Drive

**A**N ANTI-FOURTH-TERM prairie fire is burning out here in the Middle West. It is skipping from state to state like a conflagration started by lightning or carried on the wind. Before the Atlantic seaboard and politically remote Washington hear the alarm or whiff the smoke, the blaze may have spread over the country, even into the Democratic South.

In political terms, what is occurring is this: the legislatures of important states in the heart of the nation are adopting resolutions calling on Congress either to order a constitutional convention or itself to submit an amendment to limit the tenure of one man in the American presidency to two four-year terms.

Should two-thirds of the states approve this proposal, Congress, under Article V of the United States Constitution, would have no choice but to act in accordance with the amending procedure. It would be obliged, even though it disagreed, to put a two-term-limitation amendment before the nation for ratification.

That the movement is off to a fast start is made all too evident by the fact that before word of it has really begun to circulate, the politically significant states of Illinois, Michigan, Iowa and Indiana already have completed action on the petitioning resolution. Similar resolutions are pending in Missouri, Nebraska and Wisconsin as this is written, and by the time the news reaches the readers of *The New Republic* still other states will have the issue under consideration.

Here is the record in the legislatures which have sent this anti-fourth-term resolution—for that is clearly what it is—on its way:

*Indiana* (13 electoral vote). Passed State Senate without a roll call, February 1. Passed House of Representatives without a roll call, February 12.

*Illinois* (28 electoral votes). Passed State Senate without a roll call, March 10. Passed House of Representatives, 82 to 55, March 17.

*Michigan* (19 electoral votes). Passed State Senate without a roll call, March 12. Passed House of Representatives, 62 to 24, March 16.

*Iowa* (10 electoral votes). Passed House of Representatives, 88 to 8, March 12. Passed State Senate without a roll call, March 16.

The origin of the movement is not too easily fixed and it may in fact have had multiple beginnings. The Indiana resolution was introduced January 8 by State Senator Lucius Somers, Republican, who represents the

Fort Wayne district. It memorialized Congress to propose a two-term limitation for White House tenure and directed that copies be sent to the Speaker of the national House and the president of the United States Senate as well as to Indiana's congressmen.

Although Senator Somers has advised the writer that he "received many favorable comments from all parts of the nation," nothing much happened until Illinois State Senator Earle Benjamin Searcy, six-term Republican member from the Springfield district, introduced his resolution in the Illinois Senate March 9. The last paragraph of the Searcy resolution provides that copies "be transmitted to the legislatures of all other states of the Union, inviting those of like mind to pursue the course herein provided, to the end that a determination of this vital issue may be had, and, if consummated, incorporated as the Twenty-second Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, at as early a date as state ratification and constitutional procedure make possible."

This provision, lacking in the Indiana resolution, at once attracted attention among Illinois' neighbors. Before official notice had arrived in Des Moines, indeed, before the second chamber in Illinois had acted, fifty-two Republicans had joined in introducing the proposal in the House of Representatives of the home state of Vice President Wallace. On the roll call only the eight Democrats voted No. Immediately on completion of action in Illinois, the secretary of the Illinois Senate prepared official printed copies for every other legislature. Adoption came so quickly in both chambers that Senator Searcy undoubtedly was conservative when he told your correspondent that the issue would be formally presented to every state by April 1.

Thus it is that the anti-fourth term question is now before the country as squarely as presentation to the state legislatures can place it. Let us look first at the motivation and second at the significance of the movement and its possible results.

The motivation is almost entirely political. That is, it has arisen from the partisan opposition to President Roosevelt. Wherever the resolution has been introduced, the sponsor was a Republican or group of Republicans. Wherever it has passed a legislature, that legislature has been under Republican control. The campaign has got where it is because the opposition to the national administration has had the votes.

This is not to say that some legislators have not voted for the limitation in the conviction that eight years in the presidency is enough for any one man. The resolution doubtless has had its sincere supporters. But the eager Republican sponsorship and the jubilant backing of the administration's bitterest journalistic critic, *The Chicago Tribune*, strongly show the political motivation. A lot of new GOP officeholders want to beat Roosevelt and they figure this is a way to do it.

Your reporter asked Senator Searcy in Springfield why he introduced the resolution in Illinois. A veteran of the last war, who saw combat service in France and was the first Illinois Adjutant of the American Legion, he answered simply: "I do not believe the time has come for dynasties in the United States." He then went on to say that he read how Senator Guffey had taken the floor of the Senate to begin the fourth-term draft and how Representative Sabath, dean of the House, had gone to Mr. Roosevelt and had told him that he "owed it to himself and to the world" to run again. If the Democrats were going to push the fourth term fifteen months ahead of the national conventions, it was only fair to find out what the state legislatures thought about it under Article V of the Constitution. So the Illinois Senator explained himself. His resolution cites Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln as examples (just why Lincoln is not clear, since the Civil War President was assassinated soon after the beginning of his second term) and then proceeds to make the practical point that "forty-four state legislatures are in session this year and eight legislatures, including those which meet annually, will be in session in 1944."

So much for the motivation. What are the prospects for adoption by the legislatures? The first thing to note here is that this is a previously untried procedure. Each of the twenty-one amendments to the Constitution was submitted by Congress. Never before have we had the states applying to Congress to call a convention or to submit a constitutional change. So the past provides no guidance or judgment as to time. It is certainly possible that before June, 1944, two-thirds of the states may have called on Congress to submit, that Congress may have acted and three-fourths of the states may have ratified a two-term limitation. But it does not follow that what is possible is also probable. Indeed, the most avid promoters of the campaign would be surprised to see an amendment in the Constitution in time to bar legally a fourth term. Colonel McCormick's *Chicago Tribune* says: "It is not to head off Mr. Roosevelt's fourth term but his fifth."

But the supporters of the President would make a serious mistake if they waved the movement aside as unimportant merely because it does not appear likely that an amendment will be achieved before the 1944 election. And it would be a mistake to dismiss it as being largely partisan and therefore not necessarily reflecting the views of the rank and file of voters.

For this anti-fourth-term campaign would not need to wait until an amendment became part of the Constitution in order to be effective politically. Indeed, it would not be necessary for thirty-two states to apply to Congress for it to have its political incidence. Let fifteen or twenty states, including states standing as high up in the electoral college as Illinois, make application to Congress and national Democratic councils will have some hard thinking to do. It is not outside the realm of reason that such a situation would convince the practical politicians among the administration advisers that a fourth-term candidacy would mean the defeat of the Democratic ticket in 1944.

This movement throws the New Deal's troubles into sharp outline. On the one hand, it emphasizes the great defeat which the administration suffered in the congressional election last November. For the election which swept Republican Senators and Representatives to Washington also carried hundreds of Republican legislators to the state capitols. It shows what an error it was for administration leaders to flout the voters and to play politics as usual.

Second, it highlights the administration troubles in the South, since Senator Searcy of Illinois and other Northern pushers of the limitation make no secret of their hope, if not expectation, of support in the all-Democratic legislatures below the Mason-Dixon line. Judging by the reports of increasing anti-New Deal opposition among Southern Democrats, these anti-fourth-term promoters may not be disappointed.

However, if any substantial number of states endorse the limitation it would not be necessary to wait even until the presidential campaign begins to warm up to see the effects of this movement. Let a substantial number of states indorse the resolution and President Roosevelt will be embarrassed before the country and before the world. He is our war leader, and as long as he is the chief executive he is also our spokesman for the peace to come. Yet this movement contemplates a series of rebukes in one state after another until the Commander-in-Chief will virtually have been repudiated by the country at large. Not one of our allies in the United Nations could fathom a national state of mind which would permit such a thing in a time of life-and-death war.

We do not need to decide now whether the third term was wise. It is enough now to realize that this is no time for a declaration either by the President or the country on the fourth term. As *The St. Louis Post-Dispatch* has said in discussing the limitation campaign, the President is virtually barred from saying anything one way or the other:

Should he announce that he intends to run to succeed himself, his political opponents would seek to induce the people to measure all his acts and statements by that purpose. This obviously would harm his influence in domestic affairs.

On the other hand, were he to declare that he would not under any condition be a candidate for a fourth term, his value as an international leader would be greatly reduced. The heads of state of the other United Nations would immediately discount his authority as a spokesman for the American people in war matters, to say nothing of peace and post-war-planning councils.

Such is the situation, such are the prospects, such are the possible results. What can the administration do? First, it cannot fight the resolution movement. That is, unless it is willing to speed it on its way. For a condition has developed which the administration cannot control without resorting to most extraordinary means. Anything which the administration says or does should be thought out first to determine whether it will abet the campaign.

The very first thing for the administration to do is to take its over-zealous promoters in charge. Even after these first four states had completed action, Sen. James M. Mead of New York issued a statement in Syracuse saying that President Roosevelt will be "drafted and elected to a fourth term to serve for the duration of the war and the securement of peace. There is neither rule nor law against it." Granted that Senator Mead did not know about the anti-fourth-term resolution on its way through the Middle Western legislatures; the fact remains that such utterances as his only incite partisan opposition the more.

The man who can put a stop to this provocative talk is the President himself. He is still the head of the

Democratic Party. He can tell the Guffeys and the Meads and the Sabaths and the Neelys and all the others who have been advocating the fourth term this month that they are producing a serious threat to the prestige of the administration before the world. A fact which might be pointed out is that the four states which have already acted have a total of seventy electoral votes, a running start toward a majority in the electoral college.

Another thing which the administration can do is to meet this anti-fourth-term campaign with the highest level of appointments it has yet made. The parade of lame ducks into \$10,000-a-year administrative posts has been anything but an edifying spectacle. The Flynn debacle should surely have taught the lesson that pre-Pearl Harbor politics has no place in national leadership in all-out war. The administration can rise to its opportunity, and for that matter its necessity, if it will, by making merit and proved qualification the tests for every war selection, for every judicial appointment, for every executive post. Doing so, it may well win back support which it is fast losing in all parts of the country.

But if the administration shuts its eyes to what is going on out here in the Middle West it will compound the mistake of last year when it failed to see what was rattling down the middle of the road hell-bent for November 3. There ought to be somebody around Washington who could find out about all this before it is too late. There really ought to be!

St. Louis

IRVING DILLIARD

## Soldiers' Prose<sup>1</sup>

### Yankee Army in the South

WHEN the sociologists begin to decide how the war changed the people of the United States, one of the stories they will have to tell will be about how several million Yankees discovered the South and left it with a face somewhat altered. In Texas and the deep South, an area which provides the cheapest climate the army can find for its training establishment, there are scarcely more than a dozen towns with a population of 10,000 or more that do not have military installations of some nature. Thus far, the biggest effect of the war economy on the Southern town is still the juke-box variety of prosperity that has come from catering to the soldier's individual needs.

The soldier off duty looks principally for a meal, a girl, or something to drink. The commerce that has

grown up as a result has brought more Southern and Northern people into contact with one another than anything that has gone before in our history. The resulting clash of standards and mores has brought about changes, on both sides, in long held ideas about the "outlander." The most obvious changes have taken place in the towns that have become suburbs of the major camps, Fayetteville, North Carolina; Columbus, Georgia; Hattiesburg, Mississippi, and as many more towns in Texas, have lost a major part of their Southern identity. There is a Yankee briskness about them that does not seem out of place now when matched with the babble of non-Southern accents on the streets, and in the stores and restaurants which are now so heavily staffed by army wives. The Southern mistrust of the Northerner, as such, has all but disappeared in the space of a few months. The Yankees have been seen and talked to; now they have become a familiar presence.

An interesting sidelight on Yankee-Rebel relations is the introduction of many Southern areas to first and second-generation Americans for the first time. The

<sup>1</sup> This is one of a series of articles and sketches submitted in our Soldiers' Prose competition. These are paid for at our regular rates and there is also a special prize for the best entry submitted during each calendar month. The prize for February goes to Sgt. Alan Stern for his sketch, "Dear Mr Anthony," which appeared in our issue of March 1.—THE EDITORS

rural South, peopled by what the sociologists term Old American stock, had previously had very little contact with new Americans. In many cases, though not all, the Southern reaction has been a favorable one. Southerners have found some good friends among the first-generation group and vice versa. But sometimes inevitable clashes of personalities and folkways occur and serve only to reinforce the original prejudices about "foreigners," on one hand, and the Jeeter Lester stereotype of the Southerner, on the other.

One big discovery on the part of the South has been that many educated Easterners are as provincial in their own way as the backwoods sharecrooper or the most confirmed Daughter of the Confederacy. That everything west of the Hudson is not an uncharted province is something hard for many Easterners to realize; apparently, judging from many instances of tactlessness, it is even harder to conceal this lack of realization from the provincials. The provincials, who have been thoroughly educated by the Yankee radio, movies, magazines and books, are surprised to find that they know more about New York City than many a New Yorker knows about all of the rest of the country.

In the mutual exposure and exchange of prejudices, the South seems to be coming out ahead. A vast majority of the men from above the Mason and Dixon Line have followed the policy of behaving as the Romans in their relations with Negroes. Great numbers of Northerners who probably had no particular notions on the subject previously have acquired all of the more vicious Southern attitudes. One way in which Northerners absorb these attitudes—without the more humane paternalism which often is present in the Southerner's attitude toward the Negro—is by listening with dead-pan fascination to the "nigger stories" which Southerners tell—usually about their alleged experiences with public or private lynchings and beatings. Actually these stories are told chiefly because of the satisfaction of seeing and hearing the shock registering on the Northern listeners.

On the credit side, boys whose only knowledge of the South was a Hollywood, *Gone-with-the-Wind* conception, have learned some of the South's real virtues; for instance, that except for the tragic white-black abyss, it is a place of almost-classless warm and genuine friendliness. The marriage records in county clerks' offices throughout the South tell the story of the ease in establishing cordial mutual relations after the first shock of the army invasion had worn off. This, of course, has been the story of armies of occupation since the dawn of history. In many places in the South the records show as many marriages between Northern soldiers and Southern girls as army weddings involving home-town sweethearts, a most common phenomenon in these times, with hundreds of brides traveling down to the camp town for a wedding and honeymoon on a three-day pass. When the war is over, communi-

ties all over the land are going to feel the effect of the different outlook of Southern brides who have come North, and of ex-Yankee soldiers who elect to stay in the South with the in-laws.

Soldiers in the South get a good look at practically all of the seamy side of Dixie. Walking through the poverty of small towns or carrying on field maneuvers through dreary areas of eroded land and dilapidated cabins, Northerners see something of the bitter struggle for life that is the lot of such a large part of the people of this section. The reaction produced on many outsiders by these sights is merely distaste and a growing dislike for the region that the army has given them in which to train. But even the men who gain only this superficial reaction must be better prospects for the support of future national social legislation to relieve some of this distress in a large section of the country they are preparing to fight for. This is one of the most important possibilities of the training program in the South.

The look of the South is not so impressive to the average Southern boy who trains in it; but the reaction of the Northern troops has opened the eyes of many Southerners. The attitudes, "Leave us alone" and "Yankees don't understand," seem somehow meaningless when Northern and Southern soldiers, side by side, are watching the same undeniable evidence of poverty.

The Spanish-American and First World Wars have previously been looked on as landmarks in the long, slow process of dissolving the Civil War hatred between the North and South. Hatred was gone when this one started, but prejudice was still rampant. A great part of this prejudice will probably be gone when our soldiers return from the war. There will undoubtedly be a broader realization by millions of soldiers of the bigness and wholeness of the United States. Yankees and Southerners are acquiring each others' bad habits and ill founded prejudices, but by the same token they are absorbing something of the better characteristics of the different sectional cultures.

If our democratic process works at all after the war, it should result in Southern problems receiving more consideration in national affairs.

LT. FRANK SMITH

### Troop Movement

My brother called me last week-end to say he was sailing  
He didn't know where: nobody knows where any more  
Nobody knows on what beaches or even what nation  
The surf will loom and go flailing up the shore

Nobody knows but the gulls on station and the radioman  
In his headset tweaking the wind for news  
Of the weather and the dead gull and the drowned sailor  
And the ships turning into the fog with all their crews

VINCENT MCHUGH

## Washington Notes

### Will Congress Face Reality?

YOU GET so, after a while, you have a sneaking pity for the Seventy-eighth Congress. True, it is reactionary. It is fumbling almost everything it touches. But here it is spring, the birds are singing, and Congress would so like to go out and play politics and merrily knife Roosevelt all day long. For other people bulbs are coming up, but for congressmen nothing but problems spring from the ground, and three more appear for every one that is settled. They can't knife Roosevelt because, confound him, he isn't there when they think he is; and then, this exasperating war is going on and won't stop, no, not even for the farm bloc.

Not only Congress but the public is going to face a new development in the war quite soon. It really is pretty grim, though I approach the matter lightly. In fact it is a change so serious and solemn that it may come to dominate everything else, and make a new measuring stick necessary for almost everything we say and do. It is our biggest test.

The real casualties are going to start soon now. That is a frightening sentence. I hate to write it down. But there it is. And against this new development everything in America is going to change, subtly but surely. A new outlook will arise. Will it stiffen morale? Will it finally make the Seventy-eighth Congress face realities? Will it change even you and me? That is the question which rises now. The service flags hanging in the windows of American homes will begin to show more gold stars.

If you go back and read through statements by Elmer Davis ("we are only ankle deep in war"), Economic Director Byrnes, President Roosevelt and dozens of others, you will find that they have been telling us, for a long time now, of what was coming. Guadalcanal was not child's play, but this thing is bigger. Tunisia lies ahead. And after that Europe. Europe is an armed fortress.

"The casualty lists are mounting," said Gen. Alden H. Waitt last week. "Make no mistake about it. By spring these lists will appall us, and we shall begin to realize how serious the war has become."

That is what brings up once more the subject of Congress. This new Congress is really doing a pretty poor job, any way you look at it. Maybe the reason is the people back home. But for the moment I am talking about Congress. What sort of change will the new situation produce?

Just last week the Senate shouted through the Bankhead-Johnson bill, 50 to 24, to give draft deferment to farmers and anybody connected with farms, on so broad a base that if the House accepts it, it will knock holes through the draft system. It faces a presidential veto and probably couldn't override it. But as it stands it would defer from the draft single young men raising dewberries, youngberries and boysenberries (whatever they are), let alone all manner of other foods, some necessary and some that seem to be luxuries. The bill draws no distinction between hoarding labor for vital food crops, and crops like short-staple cotton and tobacco of which there is a one or two years' surplus. It is a dangerously bad bill.

The House is competing with the Senate by voting on the Kilday bill to give blanket deferment to fathers, irrespective of other important considerations. Military authorities and the President are against this, too.

But it is on the issues Congress has so far ducked that the most serious indictment can be made. These are the uncomfortable, basic issues, that get bigger and bigger even if you turn your back on them. One of them is inflation.

Way back last January 6 Mr. Roosevelt asked for \$16,000,000,000 more in taxes or savings, to check inflation. Nothing else will check inflation. Demands for higher wages and bigger farm returns stem from this spiral. It is doubtful if price controls and ceilings will hold unless this Roosevelt request is granted. . . . Well, Congress hasn't even considered the problem. The Ruml plan, one way or another, is of course important, but it is directed after all only at how to collect existing taxes, not at how to provide new revenues. And all the time Congress debates the Ruml plan, the inflationary gap grows; one estimate says national income will jump another \$15,000,000,000 this year. Nothing has been done.

The big casualties are coming, and Congress hasn't steeled itself yet to face the manpower problem. The big casualties are coming and Congress still looks at the war in terms of the farm bloc.

Let me not be unfair. Congress is learning. It just passed the lease-lend-extension bill for one year, almost unanimously. But it has the much tougher reciprocal-trade-agreements bill ahead. And only by the audacity of four young Senators has it now finally raised the issue of how far we shall go in cooperating to prevent World War III. The big casualties are just ahead, and yet many Senators still feel that Messrs. Hill, Hatch, Ball and Burton, in introducing their resolution, showed very bad taste.

I mentioned the reciprocal-trade-agreements bill because I think it will be particularly important as a test. Perhaps even more than the Ball resolution. This is because it is so specific, deals with tariff, and because of its past record.

As you may remember, the trade-agreements law, first passed in 1934, has been twice extended for three-year intervals, and expires June 12, unless continued. Some thirty agreements have been signed with twenty-six nations. At each extension so far, the majority has dwindled. At each extension the Republicans in both houses have opposed. It passed the Senate in 1940 by only five votes, without a Republican for it. Republicans have the votes to kill it now.

I think they won't, when it comes to a test. But it will be extraordinarily interesting to watch. More clearly than anything else, it may show how the wind is blowing. The rest of the world is watching it, to get a line on what Congress is prepared to do to help along post-war economic rehabilitation. Particularly on tariffs, because that is where the shoe of post-war cooperation pinches.

Face to face with heavy war casualties, will the determination to prevent another war strengthen or weaken? Will it be a unifying or a disintegrating factor? Will the casualty lists speed up or slow down the war effort?

You will know the answer to all that soon. And the place to watch for it will be in that very indecisive, very rebellious and very uncomfortable body, the weather-vane of national sentiment, poor old Congress.

Washington

T. R. B.

## "The Hard Way"

FOR THE FIRST HALF-HOUR, a movie called "The Hard Way" is the best moving picture I've seen in a long time. It takes place in Greenhill, Pennsylvania, which wasn't named for its coal-town grime and slums, and concerns a bitter woman (Ida Lupino), her coal-mining husband (Roman Bohnen) whom she left once and who in all sincerity wishes she would again, and a younger sister (Joan Leslie), who would like more than anything else a white graduation dress but instead falls in love with the clumsy half of a vaudeville team. These people are terribly plain and blundering; they are caught at unflattering moments—the high-school boy trying to get in some necking at the theatre with his stage-struck girl, who won't relax until the acrobats replace her favorites, or the husband, who is the essence of tired living, trying to be the stern father and being laughed at. Underneath this part of the picture is a bubbling, unpredictable vitality, which moves you through grimy Greenhill into its homes and lives, which are made up of minor crises, inconsequence and cursing, the people neither all villain nor all angel but somewhere in between. These early sequences have been conceived in a true cinematic manner.

After the two sisters and the vaudeville team, which one sister married into (the other saw to it that she did), leave the nondescript railroad station at Greenhill, their life stories settle grimly into the backstage movie plot in which the girl rises from sad rags to sadder riches, while her not so talented husband mopes through one-night stands, finally to shoot himself in despair. The characters now divide off into either full villain or full angel, and become people caught in a plot which will never slow down and which is always riding roughshod over them to get to the next turning point. The two people who have shown no signs of a suicidal tendency commit suicide; a perfectly ordinary singer and dancer rises from the bottom of the ladder to the status of Katharine Cornell; a woman who you've been shown can only love her sister suddenly turns up in love with Dennis Morgan, a hooper suddenly transformed into a famous orchestra leader.

"The Hard Way" lacks the emotional drive it seeks to show, of a relationship in which one woman controls and lives through the life of another. Unlike this movie, the nature of such an affair is neither so obvious nor so cold as a barber-shop pole. Watching the actions of the aggressive sister, to quote one of the actors, "is like watching the maneuvers of the Atlantic Fleet." That is to say, her character is presented with none of the sexual prompting or the overlayer of social acceptability that should be there; she rules her sister not with an iron hand in a velvet glove but with an obvious sledgehammer.

There is still, inside some of these later situations, a little of the fine directing and writing that went into the first quarter of the movie, as well as the photography of James Wong Howe, who can give substance even to trite situations. There are genre sketches, such as that of the soused actress being knocked into shape for a play reading, which are powerful in construction, and throughout there is the director's knowledge—Vincent Sherman—of the ways of the stage. Dennis Morgan, in a plum-pudding part as a

minor-league philosopher, has lines which are neither obvious nor meaningless, and a spirited ability to make them tell. I would like to point to a raucous, vulgar nurse, played wonderfully by an actress whose name is not given. Much might have happened had Joan Leslie had the dancing-singing ability her part called for, or a face which didn't change so drastically from view to view. Ida Lupino, a fine player, has the same difficulty breathing life into that straitjacket role of villain as Bette Davis had for years.

MANNY FARBER

## The Bandwagon

I have been greatly disturbed about this thing of the Congress undertaking post-war planning. To me it seems that the only thing that is going to solve our problem is statesmanship, and I do not think there is any relationship at all between statesmanship and planning. — *Representative Smith of Ohio, as quoted in The Congressional Record.*

An increase in cigarette prices must be allowed by OPA or else Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co. (Chesterfields) "is likely to earn less in 1943 than it did in 1942," said J. W. Andrews, president. — *From The Chicago Sun.*

Officials said today it would be a "pretty reasonable guess" that some local draft boards will start taking fathers of children on May 1 or shortly thereafter and that inductions of married men with children would be fairly general by early summer. — *From The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.*

### Our Secret Weapon?

The New Jersey Defense Director said his subordinates had acted in a gratifying manner during the "upside-down" test, in the course of which the "All Clear" came out over the radio before the scheduled blue and red signals had gone off. He said that, despite the mixup, a great deal of valuable information had been assembled. — *From The New York Times.*

### Nothing to Worry About

A lot of Battelstein customers are planning trips to Berlin or Rome or Tokyo this year. Important, well planned journeys for which the right clothing must be thoughtfully provided. They don't have to give it another thought if they are outfitted in Battelstein's Military Shop. — *Advertisement in The Houston Post.*

### The Human Comedy

Doris Dudley's six-year-old son plays a leading role—that of Ulysses Macauley. The boy has a brother, three years older, who appears briefly in a few scenes. . . . Their mother, Miss Dudley, is wise in the ways of children. She felt that her sensitive first-born might acquire an inferiority complex if the younger one became a movie actor and received the attention which would result. That's why both boys were signed by MGM. — *From The San Francisco Chronicle.*

### Total-War Department

HERSHEY PREDICTS END OF SINGLE MEN  
— *Headline in The New York Times.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column; \$1 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. — THE EDITORS

## Correspondence

### Erlich and Alter

SIR: I had eight exquisite minutes of reading time gobbling up the editorial—"The Erlich-Alter Executions"—in the March 15 issue of *The New Republic*. In my humble judgment, it is as fine a piece of liberalism unafraid as has graced your magazine in many a moon.

*New York City*

MAX D. DANISH, Editor,  
ILGWU publication, Justice

SIR: In the March 15 issue of *The New Republic*, in the editorial on Erlich and Alter, a letter written by Ambassador Litvinov to Mr. William Green is misquoted. The date of the execution is given in the editorial as December, 1941, while in fact in the information received from Moscow and transmitted by the Ambassador to Mr. Green the date is given as December, 1942.

*Washington, D. C.* FEDOR OREKOV, First Secretary,  
Press Division, Embassy of the USSR

### Russia and the Chinese Communist Party

SIR: I am still wondering at the seeming naïveté displayed by Pearl Buck in her letter to you in your February 15 issue. She wrote that "we should not for Russia's sake as well as China's make the accusation that Russia is using the Communist Party in China for her own ends. If this is true we must suspect Russia of making the same use of the American Communist Party, and it is precisely this sort of suspicion which will make impossible our very necessary coöperation with Russia, both now and after the war."

I favor coöperation with Russia, both now and after the war, as much as anyone, just as I favor coöperation with China and Britain. But such coöperation must be based on a clear understanding on the part of Americans of the virtues and the defects of Stalinism, of British imperialism and the Kuomintang. The first fact to be understood, as axiomatic, is that Russia always has and always will use every Communist Party in the world for Russia's own ends. Just as we must understand that the British Tories will not voluntarily extend liberty and democracy to India or other colonies; they must be forced to do so by the people of India supported by the people of America and other countries, including Britain. And that China has a one-party dictatorship. Ignoring unpleasant facts will get us nowhere.

I had thought that the idea that Russia uses Communists everywhere for purposes dictated by Stalinist nationalism had been accepted as truth by practically everyone except certain fellow travelers and idealistic Communists who are under the illusion that Russia's interests are invariably identical with the interests of the people in every country. Certainly the fact has been proved often enough—most recently in the abject support by American Communists of the pact between Hitler and Stalin until Russia was invaded. Has Pearl Buck so soon forgotten that lesson?

Of course Russia uses the Chinese—and American—branches of the Russian Communist Party (that's what they are in reality) for Russian ends. Sometimes these ends happen to coincide with the ends which liberals support. That is no reason to support, uncritically, the foreign policies of Soviet Russia, no reason to remain silent about the fact that Chinese Communist-led armies are now immobilized because Stalin and Chiang Kai-shek (both

dictators) have conflicting war aims, and political programs and national interests.

Uncritical support of Stalin is surely as bad as uncritical support of Roosevelt; and what liberal is happy about Roosevelt's endorsement of the deal in North Africa giving power to fascists who hope to entrench themselves and carry their brand of fascism from Africa to France? And what liberal gives uncritical support to Churchill, especially in connection with his Indian policy? Should not Stalin be subject to as sharp criticism as the leaders of the democratic powers? Is Russia a sacred cow?

*New York City*

LISTON M. OAK

### Christopher Marlowe

SIR: The review, by Mr. Harry Levin, of my recent book on Christopher Marlowe [February 22] contains the following purely factual blunders:

Your reviewer asserts that I assign the wrong date to John Fletcher; the book does not assign any date to Fletcher.

Your reviewer accuses me of "attaching" Lyly to the wrong theatre; the book does not attach Lyly to any theatre.

Your reviewer states that I "cast Edward Alleyn in the rôle of Edward II"; the book does not cast any Elizabethan actor as Edward II.

Your reviewer states that "theatrical records" show that another actor "created" this rôle; actually, no existing records identify any actor.

Your reviewer asserts that I ignore Mr. F. S. Boas' case for putting "Faustus" last among Marlowe's plays; Mr. Boas' view of the date is given on page 178, Volume I, though not *in extenso*.

Your reviewer rebukes me for stating that "such religious leanings as Marlowe had were very likely Roman." Marlowe said: "If there be any God or any good religion, then it is the Papists'." He was even impolite enough to add that "all protestants are hypocritical asses." Your reviewer is entitled to his own view of Marlowe's religion, to be sure—but then, so is Marlowe.

Your reviewer says that I deprive Shakespeare "of the Henry VI trilogy." Actually, I say that Shakespeare indulged in "wholesale borrowing" in two of the Henry VI plays. Shakespeare borrowed in a good many plays, but that doesn't "deprive" him of their authorship. And, of course, there are three plays in a trilogy.

Your reviewer says that these views are "discredited." Some writers have certainly said so—their views are stated on page 226, Volume II.

Your reviewer further states that the discovery of the Buttery Book of Corpus Christi proves only that Marlowe ate and drank. He might easily have learned better from the book he was reviewing. The Buttery Book (a) provides the sole record for one year of Marlowe's life, which is missing from the Audits of Corpus; (b) fixes for the first time the date of his arrival at Corpus—somewhat earlier than had been supposed; (c) establishes Marlowe's association with Francis Kett; (d) accounts for his presence or absence week by week, as the Audits cannot do; (e) therefore helps explain his movements in the secret service; and (f) sheds some light on the only extant bit of his handwriting. This bit of MS., by the way, is a new document and there are many such in the book. It is amusingly evident that the reviewer has refrained from any discussion of them.

It is occasionally possible to follow the mental evolutions which have led to these odd conclusions. For example, the book does speculate on how an actor "like Alleyn" perhaps "could" have read a passage from "Edward the Second." Then follow the words: "this is pure conjecture." By suppressing these words and thus setting forth my conjecture as if it were a positive statement of fact, your reviewer gets a neat opportunity to be caustic. Though the "theatrical records" to which he refers do not exist, the title page of the 1622 "Edward the Second" does exist. This shows that two separate companies, Pembroke's Men and the Queen's Men, both performed this play. If two companies, why not a third? No one knows. That seemed to me a good reason for making no statement and making nothing but a passing conjecture. It is entertainingly obvious that your reviewer has been looking at the Harvard copy, which names Pembroke's men, and has not examined the Yale copy (or several others like it), which names the Queen's Men.

Again, when your reviewer accuses me of assigning the wrong date to Fletcher, he is thinking of a passage which notes that "a John Fletcher, probably the dramatist, entered Corpus in 1590." By changing "a John Fletcher" to simple "Fletcher" and omitting "probably," he is again able to make a case. Unless one has read the book carefully, one is likely to be misled by Fletcher's extreme youth at this time. It would be charitable to assume that your reviewer does not know how young Elizabethan students really were. The Statutes of 1570 provided an oath for students *over* fourteen—implying, of course, that many were younger. The university also regulated the costume of "boys" as distinguished from other students. John Fletcher, if he entered at eleven, was very young even by Elizabethan standards. That is why I said "probably," the word which your reviewer forgets.

While I do not "attach" Lyly to any theatre, I do say that "the popular theatre had been refined" by Lyly's plays. This is a commonplace of Elizabethan study. It was the view of George Lyman Kittredge and of G. P. Baker, who held that Lyly's influence reached the popular stage indirectly, through the court and other audiences.

Your reviewer describes my earlier book on Marlowe as "glib journalism." That particular book was selected by the editors of *The New Republic* as one of the "Hundred Notable Books: 1937." Shall we conclude that the editors of *The New Republic* (perish the thought!) are bad judges of books? Or merely that they are fallible in choosing reviewers? Certainly a man who, like Mr. Levin, differs from *The New Republic*, must be wrong!

I do not know why a MS. dissertation, not dedicated to public use, lying in a university archive, and long since revised out of recognition, should be discussed in a book review. Few of us shine in our unpublished first drafts. That is why we do not publish them, and that is why the law makes it libelous to criticize them in print under any circumstances. However, since your reviewer regards it as in good taste to bring the matter up, I may perhaps be permitted to point out that that particular dissertation was granted several subventions by various learned bodies and was approved by the very department of which your reviewer is a member—especially by the late George Lyman Kittredge, who was also instrumental in securing the grants. Of course, it is conceivable that all these erred together and that your reviewer alone is right.

Still, Mr. Kittredge had a certain reputation, and since your reviewer has written so little in the Elizabethan field and the sample of his Elizabethan scholarship here submitted is so full of errors, one hesitates to confide too trustingly in his judgment.

Washington, D. C.

JOHN BAKELESS

SIR: . . . Mr. Bakeless now seems to accept most of the facts on which my criticism was based, and to argue—by various feats of

verbal prestidigitation and dialectical irrelevance—that he has always known them and has never deviated from them. His book, however, bears witness against his letter. On page 192 of the second volume, for example, he maintains that Fletcher was writing "just before the outbreak of the Civil War"—when Fletcher had been dead for seventeen years. Though the loose generalization about Lyly has now been qualified, the book is still full of such misleading statements. Marlowe's alleged Catholicism depends on an isolated and half-humorous remark (inaccurately quoted from a dubious source, Richard Baines, in Mr. Bakeless' letter), and passes over the serious-minded Socinianism of Marlowe's own testimony. The 1622 quarto of "Edward II" is, of course, well known under both title-pages; but since Alleyn belonged neither to the Queen's nor to the Pembroke company, it fails to support Mr. Bakeless' conjecture. His real failure is his unawareness of the difference between the ranting Alleyn roles and a subtle new characterization.

With the authorship of "Henry VI," as with the date of "Dr. Faustus," Mr. Bakeless does not try to settle the problem by re-examining the evidence, but by taking a variorum vote among all who have been rash enough to venture an opinion. Hence he gives more weight to J. M. Robertson's fantastic "disintegration" theories than to the conclusive bibliographical demonstration of Peter Alexander. As an interpreter of sixteenth-century documents, Mr. Bakeless errs from his very first chapter, by hastily inferring that a bequest of clothing could only be made to a servant, and gratuitously elevating the social status of the Marlowe household. Our confidence in his account of university life is shattered by the assertion that scholasticism has disappeared at Cambridge in 1535 (Volume I, page 58). The foregoing citations should answer Mr. Bakeless' complaints, and I shall not burden the readers of *The New Republic* with his further errors. I have therefore turned over a list of more than eighty of them to his publishers.

I am quite willing to continue this discussion with Mr. Bakeless, but I hesitate to be drawn into an argument—or, indeed, a personal rivalry—with the ghost of George Lyman Kittredge. Professor Kittredge was my teacher too, and he had many students who do him much more credit than either Mr. Bakeless or myself. They are the best judges as to whether his reputation is well served, when Mr. Bakeless invokes his posthumous blessing. . . .

Cambridge, Mass.

HARRY LEVIN

### *From The New Republic Mail Bag*

Helen Fuller, in our Washington office, sends us this glowing paragraph by Rep. John E. Rankin of Mississippi, quoted in *The Congressional Record* of March 11: "If this program, proposed by our so-called National Resources Planning Board, were put into effect, it would wreck this republic, wipe out the Constitution, destroy our form of government, set up a totalitarian regime, eliminate private enterprise, regiment our people indefinitely and pile upon their backs a burden of expenditures that no nation on earth could bear."

A reader of *The New Republic* who for very good reasons has asked us not to disclose his name, has forwarded to us the original of a remarkable letter which was written to him by Rep. D. Lane Powers, who represents the Fourth Assembly District of New Jersey. In this letter Representative Powers says that all good Americans should "insist upon the exposure of all those who are anti-Fascist, pro-Nazi, or Communistic, including the 'parlor pinks.'" The Representative wrote this letter to explain why he voted for the continuation of the Dies Committee. We hope his amazing statement is a typographical error.

## Books in Review

### Books Are Too Long

**A** GREAT MANY PEOPLE are asking why it is, with paper rationed and publishers expecting another 10-percent cut, that books are getting longer than ever. To mention only a few of the recent behemoths, there are, among the novels, "Never Call Retreat," by Joseph Freeman, with 756 closely printed pages; "Wide Is the Gate," by Upton Sinclair, with 751; and "The Valley of Decision," by Marcia Davenport, with 790. Among the books by war correspondents, there are "From Suez to Singapore," by Cecil Brown (566 pages), "Retreat to Victory," by Allan A. Michie (505 pages) and "Blind Date with Mars," by Alice-Leone Moats, called "Moatsie-Hari" by her friends—the girl who went up the Burma Road with Chanel No. 5 and came back with 486 pages of adventures inflated in the telling like night-club balloons. Alden Brooks took 704 pages to prove indisputably and for the ninety-eighth time that Shakespeare wrote no more of his own plays than a Cabinet member writes of his own speeches. And there is Hemingway's anthology, "Men at War," with 1,103 pages which I suspect that nobody except the proofreader has read from beginning to end. All these are curious items for a year when paper is scarce and printers are overworked and nobody has much time for reading.

The explanation for the great length of recent books is a long story in itself, and I am afraid it has more to do with economics than with the art of letters. Back in the 1920's, there was a standard length for novels—about 250 pages—and a standard price of \$2.50 for practically all fiction except detective stories. During the Hoover years, production costs fell slightly while sales were falling like the barometer before a hurricane. The publishers talked seriously of reducing their prices, but at this point the booksellers threatened a rebellion. They explained that when a customer entered a bookshop—something that occasionally happened even in 1932—the chances were that he would buy a single item before leaving. It was just as easy, they said, to sell him a book for \$2.50 as it was to sell him something cheaper; and they simply couldn't live on the profits from dollar books. Accordingly the publishers tried a different tack. If they couldn't sell cheaper novels to the bookshops, at least they could give the public more for the same money—more pages of smaller type and more hours of entertainment. Soon they found by experience that big books were likely to have the biggest sales.

"Anthony Adverse" had originally been planned as a series of novels, but Farrar and Rinehart decided to print it in one big volume. Its success kept most of the bookshops from going bankrupt in 1933. That same year, Thomas Wolfe delivered his second novel to Scribner's, a typewritten manuscript two feet high. It was greatly revised and somewhat shortened before its publication in 1935—the editing was masterly—but nevertheless "Of Time and the River" was a volume of 912 pages. "Gone with the Wind," in 1936, was even longer—1,037 pages—and it

had a wider sale than any other book published in English during the twentieth century. By this time all the editors had been won over to the idea of printing oversize books. If an expressman staggered into the office with a bundle of manuscript thicker than anything they had seen before, they had technicolor visions of selling nearly three million copies, not to mention first serial rights, book-club fees, second serial rights and a stylish-stout check from Hollywood.

And Americans in general have always been overawed by size. The author of a million-word manuscript suspects that he is at least ten times as great as the author of a mere hundred thousand. The publisher is equally impressed and, having made a large investment for paper and printing, he also spends more money on advertising a long novel, in order to protect his investment. Reviewers are ashamed to speak harshly of a book that has proved too long and dull for them to read; the safe course is to praise the author for his diligence, as if he were the boy who memorized Whittier's "Snowbound." The public, meanwhile, thinks that it is getting a great deal for its money. Everything conspires to favor the long novel, and the long book in general; and the result is that we are now being afflicted with a surfeit of words concealing a famine of ideas. Our authors no longer write mere family sagas; instead they concoct saga puddings. They no longer have dreams or visions; instead they indulge in elephantiasis.

Almost all the long novels published in 1942 and 1943 would have been improved by the ruthless execution of half their characters, to encourage the others. All the long books by war correspondents wanted drastic editing, which none of them received. It is perhaps too much to ask that they shouldn't repeat one another, but at least they shouldn't repeat themselves, not more than five or six times in the same chapter. As for the long treatise proving again that Shakespeare didn't write Shakespeare, it might have been deferred until some quieter time—perhaps until the Shakespeare millennium in A. D. 2654. This is a year when paper has to be saved; and I hereby suggest to authors and editors that writing and publishing shorter books is the best way to save it.

*Change of Subject.*—At last I got round to reading "Generation of Vipers," by Philip Wylie (Farrar and Rinehart, \$2.75). It is the most violent attack on American middle-class customs that has ever been made outside the totalitarian countries, and I am sorry to say that 60 percent of it is true, at a rough guess. There are three chapters—on sex, on doctors and on middle-aged Cinderellas—that are masterpieces of largely justified abuse. There is also a strong religious feeling that seems to grope in darkness, as if it were looking for a creed, a cult and a church. Mr. Wylie has courage and candor, and he always speaks for himself, even when he doesn't realize what he is saying. He attacks not only the faults of democratic culture, but also everybody who tries to cure them. He attacks democracy itself, in what he says about the com-

mon man. Sometimes he talks pretty much like a fascist, and then, as if to excuse himself, he becomes still more vehement in his hatred of the Nazis. Perhaps the biggest indictment of American democracy that he fails to mention is the honest and utter confusion of thought that this book typifies.

MALCOLM COWLEY

## Why the Japanese Fight

*Tokyo Record*, by Otto D. Tolischus. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock. 462 pages. \$3.

ON FEBRUARY 7, 1941, Otto D. Tolischus arrived in Japan to serve *The New York Times* as correspondent. On December 8 he was arrested, accused of being a spy, and he was held in jail with periodic torture until the end of May, when he was transferred to a concentration camp until permitted to leave on an exchange-ship in late June. "*Tokyo Record*" is based on events of this period. It does not, however, confine itself to these seventeen months, and the emphasis is political, not personal.

In form Mr. Tolischus' record is not unlike a newspaper. There is a chronological account of almost day-by-day political and international events; the comments on these events by the Japanese press, by statesmen and military; there are background articles to fill in details of personalities, ideology, statistics, economic conditions and international relations; there are occasional personal-experience and personal-observation narratives; and finally there are editorials to express his point of view and summarize his conclusions. The daily record is, for the most part, of absorbing interest. The method of presentation, however, makes the volume somewhat confusing. Since the material is not organized topically, in order to get a clear view of the progression of internal and international political events, the reader must go back through the volume and do his own collating. The method, however, has certain compensations—notably in capturing the feel of events in motion and communicating the hysteria of a nation in crisis.

The record covers too much ground to be adequately reviewed in brief space. The material is complex; many of the interpretations deal with extremely controversial material. But it is possible to say that in the field of reporting Mr. Tolischus performs two services of first-rate importance. The first is in filling in the background of Japan's complex international and economic problems during the critical year 1941, while the American-Japanese conversations were in progress in an effort to stave off Pearl Harbor. Here the chronological method serves the useful purpose of permitting the reader to compare the events of the year, from the Japanese point of view, with the narrative as recently presented by our State Department White Paper. The second service is in piling up data that can be used to throw light on general problems of international relations and control of aggression. For instance, his account of the "chaos and confusion" and even "panic" caused by the British and American economic sanctions strongly suggest that the reason why the sanctions were not more effective in restraining militarist Japan was that they were applied piecemeal and half-heartedly—permitting the Japanese to continue to accumulate vital stores and casting doubt on the seriousness of our intentions. Imports

from America continued to rise steeply for ten months after suspension of the commercial treaty; and the Japanese were still getting some shipments of oil from the ABD powers as late as October, 1941.

To this reviewer, Mr. Tolischus' conclusions are less satisfactory than his facts. At an early period he accepts the probability of war between the United States and Japan—basing his decision primarily upon his interpretation of Japanese history and character as expressed by their mythology. He accepts the not unfamiliar view that the Japanese are "savages"—a "warlike" people who are today fulfilling a "historic urge" to conquest. Aggression, he feels, is implicit in the theology of Shinto, and the modern Japanese are merely carrying to its logical extreme the "divine charging" of their gods to dominate the world. Since this is so, there could be no basis for agreement between America and Japan, because the two nations were "talking past each other."

In the opinion of this reviewer this account of Japanese aggression puts too much stress on a debatable misinterpretation of mythology and character, and not enough on the complex of practical economic, political and psychological problems that developed in modern Japan as a result of the imposition of the machine age, and her renewed contact with the world. There is no evidence, except mythology, to support the assumption of the warlike nature of the Japanese or their urge to conquest in their pre-modern period. To emphasize such a view has the unfortunate result of befogging the very practical issues.

In his analysis of the modern use of Shinto, Mr. Tolischus seems to mistake a technique for a cause. He appears to accept the Japanese bombastic claims to superiority on the basis of their "descent from the gods" as a statement of intention to dominate. And he appears to accept their newest doctrine of Hakkō Ichiū—eight corners of the world under one roof—as a mythological description of a practical program of world conquest. Without minimizing the interest and value of Mr. Tolischus' sections on Shinto, his comparisons with Nazi Germany and his inclusion of examples of ancient and modern mythology, it must be strongly urged that the weight of evidence supports a contrary interpretation. The modern Japanese have emphasized their mythological conquests to conceal the fact that they have no genuine conquests in their historic past. Far from meaning their mythology literally as a statement of superiority and a practical program, they have instead used it as a kind of incantation and self-hypnosis, a technique to bolster their sense of inferiority—economic and military inferiority in relation to the genuinely powerful Western powers, and psychological inferiority in face of the scientific achievements of the West, and the humiliation of Western insistence on "colored" inferiority. Of this last Mr. Tolischus provides a sharp illustration from personal experience. When he is in jail one of the captors who strikes him screams, "I'll teach you to have respect for us! I suppose you think the white races are superior to the yellow races. You call us Japs, don't you?" It seems obvious that this attack is not wholly personal. Mr. Tolischus had the ill luck to be a symbol of the "arrogant whites."

The bombast of their pronouncement and the ruthlessness of their aggression come from weakness, not strength. To fight recklessly, the Japanese must dope themselves

with the illusion of invincibility, and the illusion of their "undefeated" historic past. It seems unwise to add to the legend.

This record is a volume to be studied. It is crammed with material of absorbing interest to students of Japan and international relations. It is too bad that the index could not have been better organized to assist such study; it is inadequate to the point of imbecility. Page references to the United States, for instance, are merely given in folio, with no clue to the material covered. And although both Shakespeare and Shirer appear, there is no mention of exports, imports, labor, resources, foreign trade or budgets. This is unfair to Mr. Tolischus, who has useful material on all these matters.

HELEN MEARS

## Guns and Butter

*Economics in Uniform: Military Economy and Social Structure*, by Albert T. Lauterbach. Princeton: The Princeton University Press. 282 pages. \$3.

AMERICA'S NATIONAL INCOME IN 1941 was the highest in our history. In 1942 it was higher still. This year our national income may approach a figure twice that of 1929. Above all the cries of inefficiency in Washington, absenteeism in factories, lack of incentive on the farms, these facts stand out. Under the leadership of government bureaucrats, according to government plans, we have overcome administrative inexperience, congressional buck-passing, industrial selfishness and mismanagement, to produce many more goods and provide far greater services than ever before. Despite sharply curtailed manpower and key materials, we have solved many of the production problems of the war. After victory will we be able as well to solve the problems of peacetime? Having mobilized to produce the guns, will we be able afterwards to produce the butter? That is the crucial question of our time.

This question is neither asked nor answered by the present book, but Professor Lauterbach clarifies other problems which bear directly upon the main one: Can we have national peace without global peace? Can we have global peace without preparedness? Can we have preparedness without military economy (*Wehrwirtschaft*)? Can we have military economy and butter?

Professor Lauterbach answers only by implication, but to each question his implied and ominous answer is "no." Professor Lauterbach is a man of good will and strives to evade this lugubrious conclusion. His own evidence, however, drawn mostly from German experience, but also from our own, is against him. There is evidence that he is wrong, but it is not economic evidence. There is evidence that he is wrong, but little of it is in this book.

Professor Lauterbach is keenly aware of the cultural factors in any national situation and he has two excellent chapters on the long philosophic and political preparation for *Wehrwirtschaft* in Germany. He makes understandable German toleration of a Dr. Ley, who in peacetime in 1938 boasted that "In five years the German woman, her rifle in her hand, will bear her children in the trenches." He makes understandable German toleration of a Nazi government that "did not believe that an effective system of price control could be established or made

to work reliably over a long period without political terrorism." In his analysis of German culture Professor Lauterbach is clear and convincing. What he fails to make clear or convincing is the fact that preparedness and war need not have the same cultural consequences in America that they have had in Germany. Professor Lauterbach suggests this when he writes of Britain that there "the remarkable economic war effort has led only to a temporary suspension of certain individual institutions but not of the old governmental system and philosophy as such." Why this is so he does not explain and in the latter part of the book, where he deals with America's war effort, he is equally obscure.

Yet the problems of "Economics in Uniform"—an excellent title—are not confined to Germany, and to suggest lessons for us simply from German experience, with only slight reference to our own cultural history, is misleading. More than that, it is dangerous, for, with the example of total war in Germany before us, we might well shrink from mobilizing our own energies to the limit to destroy the totalitarian monster. To be sure, there are cultural similarities in capitalist societies and wartime societies everywhere. Yet Britain and the United States have price control without terrorism and Germany has a Hitler while we have a Churchill and a Roosevelt. Even Admiral Land will admit that here is a difference, and it is this difference that not only needs explaining, but needs profound consideration before the future is predicted.

The United States, even with its successful conversion to war production, is still far from a military economy as that phrase has been understood in Germany and Japan for the last ten years. In those countries, "preparedness" has meant the annihilation of personal and property rights and the forced substitution of *Wehrwirtschaft* for capitalism. It has meant, as one German said as early as 1930, that "In the last phase there can be no activity any more, be it even that of a home worker at her sewing machine, which does not somehow involve warlike preparation." Private contracts, competition and costs have lost all meaning in German "military economy." Instead of a private right, ownership has become a "public mission," a "duty of the individual toward the [warrior] state." The location of industry has been determined exclusively by military not economic factors; industrial technology and design have been keyed exclusively not to consumers' taste but to war. Above all, a constant growth in national income has been accompanied by a constant deterioration in living standards as entire populations have been enslaved to produce not for civilian use but for total destruction.

Military economy, as Professor Lauterbach makes abundantly clear, is not the last phase of capitalism. It is something new and different which suggests the old simply because it uses the old language. But it uses the old language in new ways, awaiting only the passage of time for new terms to be developed, or for the whole new structure to be demolished. The trend toward this military economy even in the United States is clear. Here too ownership has become a public mission. Here too more and more of the national income has been absorbed by instruments of destruction. As yet, however, we have retained most of our traditional civil rights and law has not yielded to terrorism. And while it is highly likely that we cannot have victory

without total war and that we cannot in the future have global peace without preparedness, it is also likely that, with our own cultural heritage, neither total war nor future preparedness will ever spawn here a German military economy. It is also likely that, after we have demolished that economy, our own new organization of production, our own new capital resources and our own new technology will, without violence, be converted to the production of more and more butter. No one will be more pleased to see this than Professor Lauterbach.

What we should like to see are some studies of Britain, the United States and the other United Nations at war. What we should like to see is more clarification of democratic culture and the democratic traditions out of which the future must emerge if the democratic nations are victorious. Books about the German "miracle" have been pouring from the presses for a decade. Of the type, Professor Lauterbach's is a good one, and he cleverly reduces the miracle to mundane terms. It is high time, however, that we investigated and tried to understand our own miracle.

WILLIAM MILLER

## Poets—Timely and Timeless

*Our Lady Peace and Other War Poems*, by Mark Van Doren.

*Eleven Poems on the Same Theme*, by Robert Penn Warren.

*Selected Poems*, by Carl Rakosi.

*Poems*, by John Berryman.

*The Teeth of the Lion*, by Kenneth Patchen.

*If There Is Time: Poems* by Hildegard Flanner.

*The Sword on the Table: Thomas Dorr's Rebellion*, by Winfield Townley Scott.

*The Lincoln Lyrics*, by John Malcolm Brinnin.

*A Wreath of Christmas Poems*.

*Some Odes of Pindar, in New English Versions*, by Richmond Lattimore.

*The Mirror of Baudelaire*, edited by Charles Henri Ford. Norfolk, Conn.: New Directions. *The Poet of the Month*. Bound \$1 each; unbound, 35 cents each.

IN COMMENTING, adversely, on the play of Henry VIII, Mark Van Doren observes that "the style of any good poet moves from simplicity to congestion." Certainly his own work is a case in point. The poems assembled here are more concentrated than anything else he has written, and form one of the most rewarding groups of the poetry pamphlets under review. The poems are absorbing because they deal with the subject that, like a storm at sea threatening shipwreck, either commands our entire attention or is the raging background of all our thoughts and feelings. They are valuable because they treat that subject with the candor and penetration of a mature intelligence united to a sensitive spirit. Their density, however somber, yet bristles with life. And although, as their title sardonically suggests, they have to do with war, they are not all occasional pieces. Their references are at once to the problems that beset us here and now, and to the larger fact of evil, of painful conflict, terrifying change, inevitable grief, framed by an indifferent yet fascinating universe. The poems are not

faultless. Their ambiguities are sometimes unnecessary, their images somewhat inoperative, and their music sometimes doubtful. But the group has a fine solidity, expressing as it does in compact language such experiences as *only* those who live deeply can suffer and enjoy.

This, too, is the effect of the "Eleven Poems on the Same Theme," by Robert Penn Warren. Like Carl Rakosi's stale canapés, they have been previously reviewed in these pages, but unlike them, are sufficiently interesting to deserve notice again. Not seldom Mr. Warren's imagery crowds too thickly for the reader's comfort or intelligence. Nevertheless, his poetry reveals a well tutored grasp of his instrument and a sensibility that commands respect.

Mr. Berryman's pieces, if without the particular distinction that marks the work of these poets, also explore our predicament with awareness. Perhaps because they are the work of a younger man, they are at once more personal and more melancholy, as they are as well all too obviously influenced by the performance of other poets. Mr. Berryman's most irritating fault is a repetitive hammering of words and phrases that becomes fairly obsessive. Thus he writes: "Admit, admit that now the ancient horde. . . ." Or again: "I watch, I whisper, Is it time—time?" And in the last poem: "Demand, demand our eyes and ears, demand us." These are but a few instances of his abuse of a legitimate and useful device.

Allied to these in his concern with man's fate, yet quite apart from them in his responses, is that haunted and haunting poet, Kenneth Patchen. His acrobatics, like those of other surrealist artists, have the character of dream, or perhaps more often of nightmare, and are governed almost entirely by the logic of the emotions. They are arresting. They are troubling. Repeatedly the poet leads one toward the brink of a yawning gulf or the tall gate of revelation. Yet he never takes one far enough to make the journey as awful as it promises to be. His performance is invalidated by his irresponsibility. One cannot trust a visionary who seems unable to decide whether to relate a vision or present an allegory. He is capable of tenderness as well as of brutality, but too often he is betrayed by a desire to "épater le bourgeois." It is unfortunate that a sensitiveness so keen and an imagination so sweeping should not have the eloquence that a firmer discipline would give.

The lack in Miss Flanner's verse is of another order. Ambitious in intention, it is slight in effect, partly because she is content to employ an academic style. All her lyrics bear a distinctly feminine signature, but hers is neither the subtlety of that too much neglected lyricist, Léonie Adams, nor yet the elegance of the late Elinor Wylie. Miss Flanner is capable of fine insights and neat imagery, and her verse is always melodious, but she fails to check a tendency toward the facile and the sentimental.

Where the other poets offer each a sheaf of lyrics, in "The Sword on the Table" Mr. Scott presents a cross between the narrative and the dramatic poem. His subject matter is Dorr's Rebellion, a poll-tax tragedy of a century ago enacted in Rhode Island. The work has an obvious bearing upon contemporary history. Regrettably, the characterization is not thorough enough, nor is the structure sufficiently considered, to make the piece satisfactory either as drama or as narrative. Both the material and the talent

are there, but the poet did not put sufficient strain on either.

Mr. Brinnin's "Lincoln Lyrics" gives us another flashback to American history that reveals "the capturable Now." The "American mythology" in terms of which Mr. Brinnin seeks "to restate the democratic ideal" is winningly present, and yet the poet has not quite achieved his ambitious task. For one thing, he is betrayed by the very richness of his metaphors and allusions. For another, thirty-six poems, all made up of four-line stanzas in unrhymed iambic pentameter, however careful the manipulation of the meter, produce an effect of monotony. It is in a few individual lyrics rather than in the group as a whole that Mr. Brinnin shows himself to be the gifted young poet we know.

In addition to verse by contemporaries, these poetry pamphlets offer, appropriately enough, reminders of the tradition upon which the living poet must build. Thus, the present series contains a handful of lyrics by Herrick, two groups of translations from great poets of the past and a Christmas garland which begins with a somewhat questionable version of Virgil's Fourth Eclogue, continues with sprigs from Dante, Milton, Rilke and a few more of evergreen remembrance, and concludes with Phyllis McGinley.

I am not competent to pass upon the faithfulness of Mr. Lattimore's versions of the Pindaric Odes, nor to judge whether his selection has been a happy one. I can only say that he has made acceptable English verse out of those he has chosen. The use of the word "angel," however, in translation from a Greek who flourished at the time of the Persian wars, seems doubtful, and the term "sprinter" only a little less so in its context.

The leaflet devoted to Baudelaire bears on the cover a striking line-drawing of the poet by Matisse, and is prefaced by a brief prose appreciation from the pen of Eluard and another in verse from that of the editor. Mr. Ford chose to work on no more than three poems: "Le Voyage," "Le Cygne" and "Un Voyage à Cythère." Although they do not sufficiently show the rich variety of Baudelaire's flora, this concentration of effort on poems so memorable would seem to have been the part of wisdom. Unfortunately, however, Mr. Ford has not given his versions the patient polishing they require. That he has not troubled to follow either the cadences or the rhyme schemes of the originals is less excusable, since he has not used to advantage the liberty this refusal entailed. Instead, he has taken further freedoms. He capitalizes words that Baudelaire did not thus distinguish. He introduces adjectives and even metaphors of his own. He mistranslates. Indeed, what he has given us are, as he acknowledges, adaptations rather than translations, and they leave the reader almost as acutely aware of the hand of the adapter as of that of the poet.

The "Poet of the Month" series does not regularly offer work of equal distinction, but it represents one of the few efforts to sustain the art of poetry in a critical period. In issuing these attractively made pamphlets twelve times a year Mr. Laughlin is not only doing the contemporary poet and his readers a signal service: he is helping to keep alive the values for the sake of which men are agonizing today in every part of the world.

BABETTE DEUTSCH

# Free the Fighters for Freedom!

## UNITED RALLY

for the release of

### SPANISH LOYALIST PRISONERS

and members of the

### INTERNATIONAL BRIGADES

now held in

### NORTH AFRICA

CARNEGIE HALL, Monday, April 5, 8 P.M.

ADMISSION: \$1.65, \$1.10, 55¢

Organized by the Free World Association, Spanish Section  
in collaboration with Labor, Liberal and Religious groups.

Room 1054, 55 West 42nd St. — LA 4-5408

"Without exception, the best of all the peace books. If we can carry out its militancy and its wisdom, we can win the future."

—Max Lerner

## MAKE THIS THE LAST WAR

THE FUTURE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

by Michael Straight

"An eloquent and moving book which is a major contribution toward winning the war and the peace. May it be widely read, and thought about, and acted upon."

—Frederick L. Schuman

\$3.00

HARCOURT, BRACE AND COMPANY  
383 Madison Ave. • New York

## A Reader's List

**SOUTH OF THE CONGO**, by Selwyn James (Random, \$3). A catch-all on South African politics by the foreign-news editor of PM. Contains profiles of Smuts and Hertzog, the history of the long fight over the Union's war policy and some pretty lurid stuff on Nazi activities. Madagascar, the Belgian Congo, Mozambique and other states and colonies get separate and extended treatment. The writing is lively and colorful; the facts are up-to-the-minute. Plenty of military analysis for global strategists, but the material on South Africa after the war is on the thin side.

**OUR SOLDIERS SPEAK**, by William Matthews and Dixon Wecter (Little, Brown, \$3.50). A record of what American soldiers thought and felt during six wars, from 1775 to 1918, compiled chiefly from letters and diaries. Idealists will be somewhat hurt to know that our boys have thought almost exclusively of women, food, drink and fighting, in

that order, with hardly a thought to either cause or issues. "About the only cries our men utter aloud and in wild unison are not 'make the world safe for democracy' but 'when do we eat?' and 'let's go,'" a private wrote in 1918, and with little emendation it could apply to the soldiers of all the other wars. Matthews and Wecter have compiled a valuable and utterly delightful book, required reading for the armchair types who get their idea of soldiers from "Dere Mable" and "Private Hargrove."

**FIREDRAKE: THE DESTROYER THAT WOULDN'T GIVE UP**, by A. D. Divine (Dutton, \$2.75). This is the log of the destroyer Firedrake, part of the British Eighth Flotilla, which included, among other famous ships, the Nelson, the Rodney and the Ark Royal. She got her first real start at the battle of Narvik and the Lofoten Islands, was in at the shelling of Genoa which put the Italian fleet and Intelligence to shame; and saw many dozens of running battles getting the ships through on time. It sounds like a Hollywood scenario—but is a factual document, and contributes to the salt lacking in "In Which We Serve."

Coming in the April issue of

## ASIA AND THE AMERICAS

# Geopolitics: Law of the Jungle

By LIN YUTANG

You cannot afford to miss this witty, wise and significant article, in which the inimitable Lin Yutang points out the danger as well as the absurdity of the new and growing school of geopoliticians—in America and elsewhere.

START YOUR SUBSCRIPTION WITH THE APRIL ISSUE and begin to read also the new serial—a true story which will delight you—ANNA AND THE KING OF SIAM by Margaret Landon.

April issue now on sale at all newsstands  
Special Offer: 8 months for \$2

ASIA AND THE AMERICAS, 38 East 49th St., New York City  
Please send me ASIA AND THE AMERICAS for eight months.  
I enclose check for \$2.00 in full payment.

Name.....

Address..... State.....

## Contributors

AVRAHM YARMOLINSKY is the author of biographies of Turgenev and Dostoevsky, among other books, and is at work on a history of the Russian revolutionary movement in the nineteenth century.

JOHN BEECHER was regional representative for the President's Fair Employment Practice Committee first in the South and then in New York. He is now working for The New York Post.

IRVING DILLIARD has been an editorial writer on The St. Louis Post-Dispatch for the last ten years.

LT. FRANK SMITH says, "I am a First Lieutenant in Field Artillery, Reconnaissance Officer of a 105 howitzer battery, product of OCS at Fort Sill." He is a native of Greenwood, Mississippi, and a graduate of the University of Mississippi.

VINCENT MCHUGH is the author of a novel, "Sing Before Breakfast," and "Caleb Catlum's America." He lectures on the technique of the novel at Washington Square College, New York University.

HELEN MEARS, the author of "The Year of the Wild Boar," published last fall by Lippincott, recently returned to this country after spending two and a half years in China and Japan.

WILLIAM MILLER is an instructor in American and European History at Washington Square College, New York University. He is co-author with Thomas C. Cochran of "The Age of Enterprise: A Social History of Industrial America," published last fall by Macmillan.

BABETTE DEUTSCH is the author of several books of poetry, fiction and biography.

## BOOKS

### The Story of an American Sailor Aboard a Death Ship

The most exciting and sensational sea story of this time. Unexpurgated and unabridged edition. Cloth bound. Library size.

Of the eighteen editions already printed this is the only authentic one. Two dollars (U. S. Cy.)

No cash permitted, only postal orders or checks.

(The plates of the book have been turned over to the U. S. Govt. There will be no new printing for the duration.)

CASA M. L. MARTINEZ

Apartado 2520

Mexico City

## LITERARY SERVICE

TREATISES, RESEARCH PAPERS, SPEECHES. Special Articles, reviews, promptly prepared to requirements of busy professionals. Our extensive experience available at moderate rates, with assurance of scholarly serviceable results. AUTHORS RESEARCH BUREAU, 616 Fifth Avenue, New York.

## LANGUAGES

BARGAIN PHONOGRAPH COURSE. All Makes. Mail Orders. Booklet B. LANGUAGE SERVICE, 18 East 41st Street, New York City.

## FOR RENT

BUCKS CO., Pa. Inviting country home, spacious duplex studio, conveniences, brook, couple or single woman, ideal for artist, writer. GR 7-7198, evenings, or write: Box 858, The New Republic.

## VOCATIONAL AGENCY

SECRETARIES — STENOGRAPHERS. If you are interested in working for people who read THE NEW REPUBLIC, register at the Gertrude Stein Agency, 64 West 48th Street, New York City. Wisconsin 7-4961.

## MAPLE SYRUP

PURE, VERMONT MAPLE SYRUP. Nature's Choice! Unrationed Sweet. \$5.25 per gallon, F.O.B. Satisfaction guaranteed. Charles E. Nichols, Maplewood Farm, Enosburg, Vermont.

## OUR MEN NEED ★ BOOKS ★



SEND ALL YOU CAN SPARE

★ ★ ★ ★

That book you've enjoyed — pass it along to a man in uniform. Leave it at the nearest collection center or public library for the 1943 VICTORY BOOK CAMPAIGN.

★ ★ ★ ★